

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates Hearing – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Contamination – AMINDEF Visits

Question reference number: 1

Senator: Gallacher

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 10

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator GALLACHER: How many times have you visited RAAF Base Williamtown since news of the contamination broke?

Senator Payne: I think the engagement and visits in regard to that have been undertaken by Assistant Minister Chester. You would be aware of that.

Senator GALLACHER: As minister you do not?

Senator Payne: Not me directly, no.

Senator GALLACHER: Have you ever met—obviously you have not—the concerned residents and businesses, or is that the assistant minister?

Senator Payne: The assistant minister has as I understand it, yes.

Senator GALLACHER: Do we know when those meetings occurred?

Senator Payne: No, but I will take that on notice and get that information for you.

Senator GALLACHER: The location and time of those meetings.

Senator Payne: Certainly.

Answer:

The former Assistant Minister for Defence, the Hon Darren Chester MP, visited the Williamtown and attended the meetings of the Williamtown Community Reference Group and the Elected Representatives on 8 October 2015.

Minister Chester also met with the Williamtown and Surrounds Residents Action Group when they visited Canberra on 25 November 2015.

The incumbent Assistant Minister for Defence, the Hon Michael McCormack MP, visited Williamtown and met with the Williamtown Community Reference Group and the Williamtown Elected Representatives' Group on 7 March 2016.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Contamination - Compensation Claims

Question reference number: 2

Senator: Gallacher

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 16

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator GALLACHER: I will just go through and try to get some facts on the record. At 22 December there was only one inquiry or claim for compensation. What is the situation now?

Mr Grzeskowiak: I am not aware of there being any more. The Defence legal team are talking to a number of people.

Senator GALLACHER: Perhaps you could take that on notice.

Mr Grzeskowiak: We can take that on notice.

Senator GALLACHER: I want to know if there are claims, what the level of claims for compensation are and whether they are being assessed.

Mr Grzeskowiak: I would just like to make the point that we are talking to people who have indicated that they might want to make a claim against the department. We are bound by the legal services directives and we follow those. We seek to work with people to help them through that process. But, of course, there is a process that needs to be gone through.

Answer:

Defence has publicly advised the Williamstown community that individuals and businesses may submit claims for compensation direct to the Office of Defence Special Counsel in Defence Legal (ODSC). This information was provided to the Senate Committee Inquiry during its public hearings and appears on the Senate Committee's website. The same information has been passed to the Williamstown Contamination Investigation Community Reference Group and, in person, to some individuals by Defence representatives in Williamstown.

As at 10 February 2016, ODSC had received three inquiries relating to compensation and/or land acquisition in the Williamstown area. None of the three inquirers had submitted formal legal claims (either by commencing legal proceedings or issuing letters of demand) and ODSC had been in direct contact with all three.

ODSC is aware of a range of potential claimants in the Williamstown area who have contacted the Defence hotline, made representations through their local MP or whose

concerns have otherwise been made known to ODSC. Many have expressed concerns without detailing a specific request for compensation. Personnel from ODSC have met with a number of these potential claimants to gain a better understanding of their concerns and individual circumstances.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Contamination Hotline

Question reference number: 3

Senator: Gallacher

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 19

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator GALLACHER: You said also on 22 December: I have heard that frustration today and I will take away a few things to follow up. It is not acceptable to me, for example, that people are ringing a telephone hotline that Defence has put in place and it is not being answered. That is unacceptable, so I will chase that down. So has Defence identified and resolved the problem with the phone hotline?

Mr Grzeskowiak: We have looked into that. I am not aware of how many cases there may have been when the hotline was not answered. But I think now the hotline is always monitored when it is declared to be monitored. I am hopeful that that problem has been sorted.

Senator GALLACHER: Perhaps on notice you could give the improvements and changes that you made and how many calls the hotline has taken since it was set up.

Mr Grzeskowiak: We can take that on notice.

Answer:

Defence is committed to responding to, and engaging with, the community. The telephone hotlines are therefore a matter of priority and are monitored Monday – Friday between the hours of 8:30 am – 5.30 pm AEST.

The Williamstown hotline number is 1800 011 443 and as at 19 February 2016, the hotline has received 482 calls since its establishment. The community needs to ensure that they call the correct Williamstown hotline number (1800 011 443) with queries on this issue rather than the RAAF Base Williamstown telephone number.

The Oakey hotline number is 1800 136 129 and as at 19 February 2016, the hotline has received 236 calls since its establishment.

The Williamstown and Oakey telephone hotlines were staffed during the Defence stand down period over Christmas/New Year to ensure staff were available to respond to any calls from the community.

A national hotline was established on Tuesday 23 February 2016 to provide a means for people to contact Defence regarding the investigations at other bases. The number for the national hotline is 1800 365 414. As at 11 March 2016 one call has been received on the national hotline.

The RAAF Base Williamtown and Army Aviation Centre Oakey hotlines will remain active to respond to inquiries from the community in those locations.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Contamination - Claydon

Question reference number: 4

Senator: Gallacher

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 17

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator GALLACHER: Is it correct that the member for Newcastle has made more than 25 representations to either the Minister for Defence or the assistant minister, and has to date not received a response?

Senator Payne: No, I do not think that is correct, Senator. In fact, I know that the member for Newcastle—if I remember correctly—was briefed by officials. I am not sure what month it was last year, but I will check that. It is Ms Claydon, isn't it? If it was not Ms Claydon it may have been one of her staff. I will get that detail for you on notice and come back to you. Mr Grzeskowiak has indicated that in fact there have been a number of responses made on representations from the member for Newcastle.

Mr Grzeskowiak: I have certainly signed many responses for the member for Newcastle and, indeed, some other members.

Senator GALLACHER: Was there a delay in responding while you got information together?

Mr Grzeskowiak: I think some of the responses took longer than we would have wished, but you would appreciate that we are in the process of ramping up our team to deal with this. There has been a range of issues we have had to deal with—staffing the Senate inquiry and the like. We have briefed the member for Newcastle in detail on the issue as well.

Senator Payne: Did you go, Steve?

Mr Grzeskowiak: I was involved in a briefing, I think, in her office.

Senator Payne: So there has been quite some contact there, Senator. But if I am wrong about that I will clarify on notice.

Answer:

On 8 October 2015, the then Assistant Minister for Defence, the Hon Darren Chester MP, met with the Member for Newcastle, Ms Sharon Claydon MP, Parliamentary Secretary for the Hunter and Central Coast, Mr Scot MacDonald MLC, NSW Minister for the Environment, the Hon Mark Speakman MP, and Member for Port Stephens, Ms Kate Washington MP at Newcastle Airport.

On 13 October 2015, Mr Chester met with Ms Claydon and Shadow Parliamentary Secretary for Defence, Ms Gai Brodtmann MP at Parliament House Canberra.

On 4 November 2015, Air Vice Marshal Greg Evans met with Ms Claydon at her electorate office in Newcastle.

On 2 February 2016, Mr Chester met with Ms Claydon and Ms Brodtmann at Parliament House, Canberra.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates Hearing – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Contamination - Sites

Question reference number: 5

Senator: Rhiannon

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 19

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator RHIANNON: Could you provide the committee with a map showing the area of contamination, current structures and the planned infrastructure and structures. Could you provide that please?

Mr Grzeskowiak: Just to clarify, that is on the base around the—

Senator RHIANNON: Yes, just the base.

Mr Grzeskowiak: We will provide that.

Senator RHIANNON: You said there are 16 sites where you have identified similar problems. Could you give the location of those on notice please?

Mr Grzeskowiak: We will take that on notice.

Answer:

Maps for RAAF Base Williamtown were provided in response to Question 4 from the Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade hearing into Contamination of Australia's Defence Force facilities and other Commonwealth, state and territory sites in Australia, held on 22 December 2015.

The 16 sites identified for detailed environmental investigation of perfluorooctane sulfonate and perfluorooctanoic acid are:

1. Jervis Bay Range Facility, ACT
2. RAAF Base Richmond, NSW
3. Holsworthy Barracks, NSW
4. HMAS Albatross, NSW
5. RAAF Base Wagga, NSW
6. RAAF Base Tindal, NT
7. RAAF Base Darwin, NT
8. Robertson Barracks, NT
9. RAAF Base Townsville, QLD
10. RAAF Base Amberley, QLD
11. RAAF Base Edinburgh, SA
12. RAAF Base East Sale, VIC
13. Bandiana Military Area, VIC

14. HMAS Cerberus, VIC
15. HMAS Stirling, Fleet Base West, WA
16. RAAF Base Pearce, WA

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 3 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Collins Class Project – Effective Rate of Assistance

Question reference number: 6

Senator: Xenophon

Type of question: asked on 3 March 2016, Hansard page 8

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator XENOPHON: No, we are not talking about the future submarines. We are talking about the Collins-class submarines.

Dr Bourke: To clarify that point: the purpose of creating a model and using Collins data in that context is to help frame the structure of the model which can then be used for SEA1000. That was the objective from day one of this project and it is the objective now. What I am saying here is that the Collins information was simply used to scope the structure and adjust the parameters of the model so that, when the cost data arrived for SEA1000, the model had been structured for a submarine environment and we could then proceed to generate results. The results of running some Collins data through the model simply served the purpose of allowing us to structure the model correctly.

Senator XENOPHON: I am perhaps doing this at cross-purposes and I apologise if I did not ask the question with sufficient clarity. I am not asking about the Macroeconomics report or the inputs. I am asking about the Collins-class project and the inputs and outputs that you referred to generally but I am applying it quite distinctly from the Macroeconomics report about the SEA1000 project. I am asking if you as an economist within Defence have undertaken an analysis of issues such as, for instance, the effective rate of assistance, the national economic impact, the local economic impact, the number of jobs at the peak time of build, the indirect jobs created, the economic spillovers and the technical innovation spillovers in respect of the Collins project as quite distinct from the issue of the Macroeconomics report.

Dr Bourke: No, certainly not.

Senator XENOPHON: But you would have details of the effective rate of assistance for the Collins project?

Dr Bourke: Not unless we calculate it specifically for the project?

Senator XENOPHON: It has never been calculated?

Dr Bourke: Not that I am aware of.

Senator XENOPHON: Can you please take that on notice?

Dr Bourke: I can certainly check that.

Answer:

No. Defence is not aware of any estimates of the effective rate of assistance specific to the Collins submarine build project.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 3 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Macroeconomics Framework – Other Projects

Question reference number: 7

Senator: Xenophon

Type of question: asked on Thursday, 3 March 2016, Hansard page 9

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator XENOPHON: I understand. The tender document that Macroeconomics eventually won made a sensible suggestion that the economic model could be used for other projects such as the offshore patrol vessels and future frigates. Can you indicate whether the model that has been developed can in fact be used for those other projects?

Dr Bourke: Yes, and you are correct. The original intention of the study, which encompassed the Macroeconomics paper you referred to, was twofold. It was to develop an economic model which we thought might be applicable to Defence capital equipment projects generally—not just submarines but others and perhaps the project that you have mentioned. Then, of course, it was to look at the submarine example of that. So, yes, I think the approach that has been developed since we started this project is applicable to other Defence projects and probably the one you mentioned.

Senator XENOPHON: My question was whether the Macroeconomics framework developed for the tender could be used for other projects such as the OPV and future frigates. Dr Bourke helpfully answered that the economic model could be used. Is it the plan of Defence to adopt the model used for the Future Submarines Project in terms of economic modelling for the OPVs and future frigates given the considerable value of those projects?

Mr Richardson: I would need to take that on notice.

Senator XENOPHON: You can understand. It is not a trick question; it was referred to in the document.

Mr Richardson: Yes, I do. We will answer directly; I just need to check with the head of the surface project.

Senator XENOPHON: So it is a straightforward question.

Mr Richardson: Yes.

Senator XENOPHON: It is foreshadowed in the tender document. I am just trying to establish it. It seemed to be a fairly good thing to establish the economic impact—even though we have not seen it. It might be relevant in terms of the future frigates and the OPV. I do not know whether Mr Gillis is able to comment in respect of that economic modelling.

Mr Gillis: I would have to take that on notice. The general manager of surface ships is in Adelaide at the moment.

Answer:

The merits of undertaking such an analysis will be considered at the next phase of the CEPs.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Combat Ration Packs

Question reference number: 8

Senator: Bernardi

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) Regarding the decision to ensure the combat ration packs have halal, vegetarian and kosher meals included, what is the proportion for each of these requirements? (e.g. for a 12-pack of rations, how many have to be halal, kosher and vegetarian?)
- (b) Which kosher certifying body is responsible for certifying the food in the kosher ration packs? If the ADF or Department of Defence does not deal directly with the certifier, which supplier is used to supply the certified food and which certifying body is used by that supplier to certify the food?
- (c) How much does the ADF or Dept of Defence or the supplier pay to have the food certified that is used in the kosher ration packs?
- (d) Which halal certifying body is responsible for certifying the food in the halal ration packs? If the ADF or Department of Defence does not deal directly with the certifier, which supplier is used to supply the certified food and which certifying body is used by that supplier to certify the food?
- (e) How much does the ADF or Department of Defence or the supplier pay to have the food certified that is used in the halal ration packs?
- (f) Had senior ADF personnel or senior management within the Department of Defence received complaints from ADF personnel that there was a lack of kosher, vegetarian and halal options in ration packs, and did this prompt the decision to include them? Or was this a decision made by senior personnel without any complaints having been received?

Answer:

- (a) In order to meet our future force support requirements, Defence intends to trial a new concept to ensure delivery of future ration packs to the personnel who need them. This future ration concept considers the requirements of a more diverse Defence workforce. It is anticipated that the 12 rations in each box will feed 12 people for 24 hours, with each individual ration containing two separate pouched main meals. This concept aims to address the needs of Defence's diverse workforce through offering ration boxes which will be wholly standard, halal, kosher or vegetarian. This concept has been identified to allow for ease of distribution, rather than having individually interchangeable

elements. Under this concept, units will order standard, halal, kosher or vegetarian boxes to meet the requirements of its personnel.

- (b) to (e) Defence does not currently have a kosher ration pack. Defence has not engaged with any certifying body regarding the process or costs involved in certifying ration components.
- (f) Army personnel have provided feedback both to Army and the Capability, Acquisition and Sustainment Group concerning the provision of food for halal, kosher, Hindu, and vegetarian.

The requirement for the inclusion of kosher, halal and vegetarian food into ration pack menus is a result of the decision to adopt a mission adaptive modular pack. The current method of providing food for religious, cultural and medical purposes is to use substitution by commercial components, which is currently carried out by units on an 'as required' basis and operates on a lag system where stocks are demanded after the start date of an exercise. This process is not sustainable for future operational scenarios.

The inclusion of vegetarian, halal and kosher rations will allow the Australian Defence Force to formulate menus that better meet the needs of users. The ongoing trial period for the proposed ration packs will conclude in 2018, before being introduced into service.

Senate Standing Committee Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Budget Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Ministerial Functions – October 2015

Question reference number: 9

Senator: Bilyk

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

In relation to any functions or official receptions hosted by the Ministers or Assistant Ministers/Parliamentary Secretaries in the Defence portfolio since 20 October 2015, can the following please be provided:

- a) List of functions;
- b) List of attendees including departmental officials and members of the Minister's family or personal staff;
- c) Function venue;
- d) Itemised list of costs;
- e) Details of any food served;
- f) Details of any wines or champagnes served including brand and vintage;
and
- g) Details of any entertainment provided.

Answer:

Details of functions or official receptions hosted by the Minister for Defence and the Assistant Minister for Defence since 20 October 2015 is provided at Tables A and B respectively. The lists of attendees reflects RSVPs received.

TABLE A: Details of functions and official receptions for the Minister for Defence since 14 September 2015

Description	Location	Date(s)	Attendees	Details of Food, Drinks & Entertainment	Total (incl GST)
Foreign Defence Attaché Function	Parliament House, Canberra ACT	12 November 2015	Carol Abraham Tareq Al Bannay Sultan Al Dhaheri S.A.H Alazraqi J.A.A. Albaidhani ?, Apichai (<i>no first name provided</i>) Muhammad Asghar R. Barros Charlotte Boyer Connor Canlas Mark Chadwick Chetan Chandegave Derrick Chew Nguyen Manh Chu Nithi Chungcharoen Shaun Clarke Antonio Coppola	\$5,858.58 (incl GST): <i>Catering for function provided by Parliament House Catering. Details of food served not available.</i> \$486.30 (incl GST): 2x (24x375ml) Boags Premium Lager 2x (24x375ml) Boags Premium Light 6x 750ml Annies Lane Shiraz 6x 750ml Jacobs Creek Sauvignon Blanc 6x 750ml Yarra Burn Vintage 2x 1.25L Coke 4x 1.25L Schweppes Mineral Water Natural	\$6,344.88

			Scott Dewar J. Fabila Orlando Franchi John Frewen Yildirim Gunes K. Hendriksson Stewart Holbrook Jon Hough Sandeok Hwang Harold Jacobs Action Kilby Yann Marboeuf Crisoforo Martinez Parra C. Mighera Gary Miller Robert Moody H. Mulyando Hiroaki Murakami Hiroyuki Nakamura N. Pakdipongpitchaya	2x 1.25L Coke Zero Nil entertainment	
--	--	--	---	---	--

			Hoang Tam Phuc Shi Qiao Mhd Nazri Abd Rahman Brent Reiffer M.Doug Sachs Morm Seyah Lam Pei Sien Sokretya Sowarth W. Syofyan Patrick Teague F. Traconis Adisorn Unhalekhaka Paolo Vellejo Riva Yanto Chu Yunfeng Raul Zamorano		
34 SQN Thank You Function	Parliament House, Canberra ACT	25 November 2015	The Hon Malcolm Turnbull MP Senator the Hon Simon Birmingham Senator the Hon George Brandis QC The Hon Jamie Briggs MP	\$6,853.28 (incl GST): <i>Catering for function provided by Parliament House Catering. Details of food served not available.</i>	\$7,115.17

			The Hon Darren Chester MP Senator the Hon Mathias Cormann The Hon Peter Dutton MP The Hon Paul Fletcher MP The Hon Josh Frydenberg MP The Hon Alex Hawke MP The Hon Dr Peter Hendy MP The Hon Barnaby Joyce MP Senator the Hon James McGrath Senator the Hon Fiona Nash Senator the Hon Marise Payne The Hon Christopher Pyne MP The Hon Andrew Robb AO MP The Hon Stuart Robert MP Senator the Hon Ann Ruston Senator the Hon Scott Ryan Senator the Hon Nigel Scullion Senator the Hon Arthur Sinodinos AO The Hon Warren Truss MP The Hon Ken Wyatt AM MP	\$261.89 (incl GST): <i>2x 750ml Annies Lane Shiraz</i> <i>4x 750ml Yarra Burn</i> <i>Vintage</i> <i>4x 750ml Jacobs Creek</i> <i>Sauvignon Blanc</i> <i>24x James Squire 150 Lashes</i> <i>Pale Ale</i> <i>3x 2L Coke</i> <i>3x 2L Coke Zero</i> <i>12x 1.25L Schweppes</i> <i>Mineral Water Natural</i> <i>Nil entertainment</i>	
--	--	--	---	--	--

			<div>The Hon David Feeney MP</div> <div>Ms Laura Wood</div> <div>Ms Kathy Casey</div> <div>Ms Gai Brodtmann MP</div> <div>ACM Mark Binskin AC AO</div> <div>Mrs Gitta Binskin</div> <div>VADM Ray Griggs AO CSC RAN</div> <div>LEUT Karra White</div> <div>AM Gavin Davies AO CSC</div> <div>Mrs Rhonda Davies</div> <div>FLTLT Sarah Johnston</div> <div>LTGEN Angus Campbell DSC AM</div> <div>CAPT Nicholas Trotter</div> <div>WO1 Don Spinks</div> <div>ACW Lateesha Barlow</div> <div>SGT Christopher Bell</div> <div>FLGOFF Thomas Breaden</div> <div>LEUT Adam Bush</div> <div>FLTLT Joshua Daish</div> <div>WOFF Matthew Davis</div>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			FSGT John Forth FLTLT Anna Frisina FLTLT Craig Gillies FLGOFF Sarah Hume SGT Courtney Hutt CPL Millyssa Johnston FSGT John Kingston FLTLT Tania Launder FLTLT Scott Maccallum SGT Peter Madigan CPL Karryn Monaghan FLTLT Christopher Moore WOFF Thomas Neylon LAC James O'Callaghan WGCDR Steven Parsons CPL Yalin Phung FLTLT Paul Rattigan FSGT Craig Rowland FLGOFF Caitlin Rytenskild SGT David Salerman		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			SQNLDR Mark Saurins Mr Eric Sellers CPL Brimlea-Jane Smyth FLTLT Mark Szandurski FLTLT Paul Templeman CPL Steven Thomas LAC Rian Toyer FSGT Carly Trethowan SQNLDR Christopher Tubbs SGT Damien Williams FLTLT Scott Youngson		
Morning Tea for Business Woman of the Year	Parliament House, Canberra ACT	26 November 2015	CAPT (N) Mona Shindy BRIG Georgeina Whelan Senator Chris Back The Hon Bruce Billson MP Senator the Hon Simon Birmingham Gai Brodtmann MP The Hon Darren Chester MP The Hon David Feeney MP Senator the Hon Concetta Fierravanti-	<i>Catering for function provided by Parliament House Catering. Details of food served not available.</i> \$1,200 (incl GST): <i>Banquets Setup Fee</i> \$390 (incl GST): <i>Banquets Coffee Break Food</i> <i>Nil entertainment</i>	\$1,590.00

			<p>Wells</p> <p>The Hon Joel Fitzgibbon MP</p> <p>The Hon Josh Frydenberg MP</p> <p>The Hon Teresa Gambaro MP</p> <p>Andrew Hastie MP</p> <p>Sarah Henderson MP</p> <p>Luke Howarth MP</p> <p>Eric Hutchinson MP</p> <p>Steve Irons MP</p> <p>Senator Jo Lindgren</p> <p>Louise Markus MP</p> <p>Russell Matheson MP</p> <p>Cathy McGowan AO, MP</p> <p>Senator Bridget McKenzie</p> <p>Senator Claire Moore</p> <p>The Hon Kelly O'Dwyer MP</p> <p>The Hon Melissa Parke MP</p> <p>Senator Nova Peris OAM</p> <p>Graham Perrett MP</p> <p>The Hon Jane Prentice MP</p>		
--	--	--	---	--	--

			Senator Linda Reynolds CSC The Hon Stuart Robert MP The Hon Philip Ruddock MP The Hon Tony Smith MP Andrew Southcott MP Ann Sudmalis MP Nickolas Varvaris MP Ross Vasta MP Senator Larissa Waters Matt Williams MP Tony Zappia MP ACM Mark Binskin AC, CDF LTGEN Angus Campbell RADM Anthony Dalton		
--	--	--	--	--	--

TABLE B: Details of functions and official receptions for the Assistant Minister for Defence since 14 September 2015

Description	Location	Date(s)	Attendees	Details of Food, Drinks & Entertainment	Total (incl GST)
Young Endeavour Youth Scheme	Parliament House, Canberra ACT	13 October 2015	The Hon Darren Chester MP	\$200.00 (incl GST): <i>Australian cheese plate with</i>	\$984.55

Briefing on activities and promotion to members.			<p>The Hon Bronwyn Bishop MP</p> <p>Rob Mitchell MP</p> <p>Gai Brodtmann MP</p> <p>Senator Claire Moore</p> <p>Rick Wilson MP</p> <p>Louise Markus MP</p> <p>Senator David Fawcett</p> <p>Senator the Hon Eric Abetz</p> <p>The Hon Jane Prentice MP</p> <p>David Gillespie MP</p> <p>Kevin Hogan MP</p> <p>The Hon John Cobb MP</p> <p>Amanda Rishworth MP</p> <p>Senator the Hon Fiona Nash</p> <p>MIDN Luke Searle</p> <p>MIDN Amy Campbell</p> <p>OCDT Plunkett-Gregory</p> <p>OCDT Slater</p> <p>MIDN Turner</p> <p>MIDN McKee</p>	<p><i>dried fruit for 10 people.</i></p> <p><i>\$720.00 (incl GST):</i></p> <p><i>Beverage Package for 30 people including:</i></p> <p><i>Beaumont sparkling wine</i></p> <p><i>Beaumont Sauvignon Blanc</i></p> <p><i>Semillion</i></p> <p><i>Beaumont Cabernet Merlot</i></p> <p><i>Carlton Draught</i></p> <p><i>Cascade Light</i></p> <p><i>Assorted soft drinks and assorted juice</i></p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

			MIDN Ryan Cavanagh OFFCDT Liam Donohoe Marshall Baillieu Stephen Moss RADM Jonathan Mead VADM Ray Griggs John Dixon Dion Curtis Jess Turk Lachlan Campion Andrew McKenzie Nikki Fitzherbert Fiona Herbert Stuart Bryson Jennifer Reilly Brie Colley Shane Coles Rob Curtin		
Community Information Session on Contamination	Oakey Returned and Services League, QLD	04 December 2015	The Hon Darren Chester MP The Hon Ian Macfarlane MP	<i>Tea and coffee included in room hire cost.</i>	\$165.00

Issues at Oakey, QLD			50+ members of the public		
----------------------	--	--	---------------------------	--	--

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Secretary's Speeches to Staff

Question reference number: 10

Senator: Bilyk

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Can a copy of any speeches delivered by the Secretary of the Department at any staff meetings since 20 October 2015 please be provided?

Answer:

Please refer to Question on Notice No. 67 from the Supplementary Budget Estimates hearing of 21 October 2015. This response remains extant.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Stuart Roberts – Leave Letter

Question reference number: 11

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 24

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator CONROY: Did the letter seeking approval indicate that the minister proposed to travel to Singapore from Australia? Or China?

Mr Richardson: I do not know the answer to that.

Senator CONROY: You do not have a copy? There is no copy on file in the department?

Mr Richardson: Well, I will inquire, but certainly I have not seen a copy.

Senator CONROY: To be clear: when ministers travel, they have a section in their own department that handles their travel arrangements.

Mr Richardson: That is right.

Senator CONROY: And they would not have a copy of the letter?

Mr Richardson: I said I will inquire. I will take that on notice and I will come back to you.

Senator CONROY: If the department does have a copy of that letter, could we have it tabled?

Mr Richardson: I would need to take that on notice.

Senator CONROY: A letter seeking leave? You require—

Mr Richardson: I would need to take that on notice.

Answer:

On 13 August 2014, the then Chief of Staff to Minister Stuart Robert, Mr Robert McKellar, wrote to the then Chief of Staff to the Prime Minister, Ms Peta Credlin, seeking permission for Minister Robert to attend the Singapore-Australia Joint Ministerial Committee meeting in from 21-22 August 2014. The letter noted that Minister Robert would travel from Beijing to Singapore.

A copy of the letter is attached.



**Office of the Hon Stuart Robert MP
Assistant Minister for Defence**

AMINDEF/OUT/2014/71

Ms Peta Credlin
Chief of Staff
Office of the Prime Minister
Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600

13 AUG 2014

Dear Ms Credlin

I am writing to seek the Prime Minister's approval for the Hon Stuart Robert MP, Assistant Minister for Defence to travel to Singapore to attend the biennial Singapore-Australia Joint Ministerial Committee (SAJMC) meeting.

Minister Robert will be replacing Senator the Hon David Johnston, Minister for Defence, who is now unavailable to attend.

Minster Robert will maintain the same itinerary as Minister Johnston's previous proposal, with the exception that due to previously arranged leave and personal travel arrangements, he will travel to Singapore from Beijing. Minister Robert's duty travel will commence with the transit from Beijing on Thursday 21 August and end on his return to Australia on Saturday 23 August 2014.

Minister Robert will be accompanied in Singapore by Mr Dennis Richardson, Secretary of Defence, his Aide-de-Camp, Flight Lieutenant Craig Gillies and myself.

Senator the Hon David Johnston, Minister for Defence will be available to act as the Assistant Minister for Defence during the period of Minister Robert's absence.

I would be grateful if you could obtain the Prime Minister's agreement to the proposed travel as set out above.

Yours sincerely

Robert McKellar
Chief of Staff

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 3 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Macroeconomics Report - Studies

Question reference number: 12

Senator: Xenophon

Type of question: asked on Thursday, 3 March 2016, Hansard page 10

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator XENOPHON: I know. One of the inputs to the Macroeconomics study was as per the statement of work at 2.2C: 'copies of a range of economic impact studies for individual capital equipment projects which were commissioned by the department in recent years and cover a number of regional locations as industry areas'. Can you provide the committee with those studies given that they do not appear to be subject to any claims of cabinet in confidence?

Dr Bourke: I believe so. I might take it on notice, but at this stage I would not see any problem with that.

Senator XENOPHON: If you could. I do have some other questions, but I am not sure whether any of my colleagues have questions.

Answer:

Defence has identified and made available the following economic impact studies which are neither Commercial-in-Confidence nor Cabinet-in-Confidence and were commissioned in whole or in part by the Department since the completion of the preliminary analysis by Macroeconomics noted in the Question on Notice.

All the documents have previously been released publicly by Defence. However, the Department does not necessarily endorse the findings of the documents and cautions that the documents may not reflect the outcome of analysis currently being undertaken into the economic impact of the Future Submarine Program SEA 1000.

Some of the documents are lengthy and not available by web link. Therefore, the documents will be provided in electronic form:

- The Allen Consulting Group Pty Ltd, *Defence and Australian Industry: Description and Economic Analysis*, Canberra, November 1992.
- Tasman Asia Pacific, *Impact of Major Projects: A Case Study of the ANZAC Ship Project - Final Report*, Canberra, February 2000.
- Tasman Asia Pacific, *Impact of Major Projects: A Case Study of the Coastal Minehunter Coastal Project*, Canberra, January 2002.
- SGS Economics and Planning, *The Economic Contributions of Five Defence Air Bases - Final Report*, June 2008.
- SGS Economics and Planning, *The Economic Contributions of Three Queensland Defence Precincts - Final Report*, July 2010.
- KPMG, *Economic Report into the Major Defence Bases in the Northern Territory*, Canberra, September 2010.
- KPMG, *Economic Contribution of the Naval Bases in Sydney*, Canberra, 31 January 2011.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Liability

Question reference number: 13

Senator: Fawcett

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 26

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator FAWCETT: I just want to continue our line of discussion around recording of absorbed measures in the defence budget. We have had a number of discussions in the past about how to highlight what the flow-on impacts have been, and we have had some discussions about various mechanisms to identify that to the parliament. One of the comments you have made to me in the past is that, within your formal reporting, it is difficult for you to put any measure of that. I notice in this year's annual report, on page 79 in table 4.3 on the net additional cost of operations over a period, that down towards the bottom of the table under 'Total net additional costs', 'Sources of funding for operations', one of the sources that has been identified is 'Department of Defence (absorbed)'. So you have clearly broken out there the fact that you have been instructed to absorb measures, and that is how much has come into your operational bucket. What would prevent you from taking that same accounting methodology in all the other areas, whether they be facilities or personnel, to identify that part of the funding you have used to run the organisation—whether it is removing asbestos or fixing fuel farms, or whatever—has come from absorbed measures? Clearly, you have identified an amount, or else you would not have that amount here in the table. What is then to stop you having a footnote somewhere to say that these are the areas that have been impacted, so that, for every decision taken to direct you to absorb, the parliament, as well as the minister and others, understand what the lingering cost to the organisation is?

Mr Prior: If you were to look at the additional estimates document on page 19, we do identify and have, for as long as I can recall, always identified any government decisions that are absorbed, and they are articulated in the measures table. In terms of government decisions that are taken, and to the extent that they are funded by Defence, those measures are articulated in the documents that we table around the budget. So that is not something new; that has always been there. In terms of anything that is absorbed beyond that: we are now required under accounting standards to report a budget/actual variance in our annual reports, and you would see that in the annual report you are referring to. So, to the extent that there has been a change, or in how the plan has changed, that mechanism of variance reporting in annual reports would be, in my view, the way that that could be identified—that is, to the extent that there is a plan and that is articulated in the budget document, if the plan were to

change and there were to be reprioritisations, you would then see that come through in that variance report.

Senator FAWCETT: But would the variance report give the opportunity to flag where the funding shortfall now lies? I still find it unacceptable that we were at a point a couple of years ago where we had fuel farms that were being risk-managed at a service chief level as opposed to being remedied, and that was a consequence of decisions taken by government and priorities made by Defence—all quite a valid process—but there was no visibility of the impact that was having and the extent of the measures that were having to be taken to manage the growing risk and backlog of work. We need to have a mechanism whereby those amounts can be correlated to what has not been done, whether it is training for capability or facilities maintenance, otherwise they get lost, and people do not realise the consequences of decisions they make.

Mr Prior: As you said in your opening comment, the technical difficulty continues to be one of trying to produce financial information that is compliant with all the various accounting rules and so on, particularly in terms of measurement reliability. That is the most significant accounting concept that we have to deal with in this discussion. To that extent, as you would also see in that annual report, we have sections on contingent liabilities, remote contingent liabilities, unquantifiable contingent liabilities and so on, and those articulations are an attempt to identify those things that are difficult to measure.

Senator FAWCETT: The chair is giving me the wind up, so can I ask you to take on notice and come back to the committee with a proposed solution. You talked about the difficulties, and I accept that. I am not an accountant, but I accept the fact that there are accounting standards; there are certain things you can and cannot do. But it is not beyond the wit of man, I am sure, to find a way to put into reports to the parliament the impact of decisions that have been taken around priorities and measures that have been absorbed. Can you come back to the committee on notice with a proposed solution as to how you could do that.

Mr Prior: I can certainly have a look at that.

Answer:

The 2016 Defence White Paper has rebalanced the Defence budget to meet the Government's long-term plan for Australia's defence. This rebalance has provided significant investment in Defence capability (including major capital equipment, facilities, infrastructure and information and communication technologies) and has been rigorously cost assured by external assessors.

Any future variations to the funded commitments in the White Paper will be considered through the mechanisms developed in accordance with the recommendations of the First Principles Review. Any additional commitments will be managed transparently in an enterprise-wide approach across the Defence Portfolio, with in-year commitments managed by the Enterprise Business Committee, and forward-years commitments managed by the Investment Committee.

Any changes in planned expenditure across Defence programs, including funding shortfalls resulting from absorbed measures, will be detailed in the Portfolio Statements. In addition, under the Australian Accounting Standards, Defence is required to provide explanations of major variations between actual and budget amounts. Underspends in Defence capability will be evident in Defence's annual financial statements and Portfolio budget papers. These documents are open to scrutiny through the Senate Estimate Committee process.

The Framework for the Preparation and Presentation of Financial Statements issued by the Australian Accounting Standards Board notes that an essential characteristic of a liability is that an entity has a present obligation. A decision by management to acquire assets in the future does not, of itself, give rise to a present obligation.

Defence's actual and contingent liabilities, as defined by Australian Accounting Standards, are accounted for and disclosed in the annual financial statements. Underinvestment in Defence capabilities is considered in the preparation of the annual financial statements when identifying whether assets may be impaired in accordance with Australian Accounting Standards.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: CEP Submarines – Requests for Clarification

Question reference number: 14

Senator: Xenophon

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 27

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator XENOPHON: Maybe I will request clarification on 'request for clarification'. Can you explain the nature of that request? Is it designed to clarify responses or is it designed to elicit new information?

Rear Adm. Sammut: No. As I stated, and I need it to be very clear, it is to clarify responses; it is not to elicit new information.

Senator XENOPHON: And the probity audit is presumably a sign-off to ensure that it is simply a case of clarification, not the eliciting of new information?

Rear Adm. Sammut: Indeed.

Senator XENOPHON: So the probity auditor—

Rear Adm. Sammut: There is a review process whereby any clarification question sent to a participant is reviewed independently by our probity adviser before it is sent out to any participant to ensure it conforms with the regime by which we are seeking a clarification of information already provided. It is not often an opportunity for participants to improve their offer.

Senator XENOPHON: But in so far as a request for clarification might give a participant—and I am not thinking of any participant in particular—an opportunity to provide new information, how do you and how does the probity auditor deal with that? So it might be that, on the face of it, you are simply requesting clarification but that clarification provides the information.

Rear Adm. Sammut: So two steps: in the first instance, the question is considered to ensure that it does not provide any participant with the opportunity; however, if more information is provided to us, what I did not mention is that the response is vetted by the probity adviser before it is released to the evaluation working groups to ensure that it has not offered new information over and above what was originally put in the proposals.

Senator XENOPHON: Can you on notice provide us with the number of requests for clarification and the number of responses. I am not actually asking you for the details of that but I just want to get a flavour of how many requests there have been for clarifications and what—

Rear Adm. Sammut: We have that data; I can provide that on notice.

.....

Senator XENOPHON: I understand that but, to date, how many requests for clarifications have there been to the French, the German and the Japanese bids; and how many responses have there been from each of those bids? I am not asking you for details of the nature of the clarifications sought but details of: have you sought more clarifications from one bidder than from others?

Rear Adm. Sammut: I can take that on notice, because we have listed that. They are of the order of 20 to 30 questions at this stage.

Answer:

To uphold the integrity of the Competitive Evaluation Process and avoid speculation as to how the evaluation of proposals is proceeding, based on probity advice received by the Future Submarine Program, the number of clarification questions asked of each participant and the number of responses received should not be released publicly.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates –10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: RTI Training - Observers

Question reference number: 15

Senator: Lambie

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard p.31

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator LAMBIE: Can I please have, on notice, the number of resistance to interrogation exercises or courses conducted every year for the last 16 years, the number of personnel on each exercise, a list of all the equipment used and the total cost of each exercise?

Lt Gen. Campbell: Yes.

(.....)

Senator LAMBIE: Were females present or allowed to participate on these resistance to interrogation exercises that involved the SAS?

Lt Gen. Campbell: To date, persons serving in special forces have only been men who are barrier qualified.

Senator LAMBIE: You have brought in no ADFA or military police females to be involved in those exercises?

Lt Gen. Campbell: Senator, if you are speaking to a broader group of persons who might experience some sort of resistance to interrogation training experience, there may well have been at some point women. I would have to take that on notice

(.....)

Senator LAMBIE: Had any of the interrogation subjects been subjected to physical assault either prior to or as part of the resistance to interrogation exercises?

Lt Gen. Campbell: There is no justification or acceptability of physical assault at any time in either the Army or the Defence Force more broadly and that includes resistance to interrogation.

Senator LAMBIE: I did not ask you for justification; I am asking you whether or not there have been allegations of assault as part of these RTI exercises.

Lt Gen. Campbell: I am now aware from your statement in the House of one such allegation. I will take on notice as to whether we have record of any other such allegations being made.

(.....)

Senator LAMBIE: How many hours of these recordings are stored by the Australian Defence Force and are these recordings then used for further training purposes?

Lt Gen. Campbell: I will have to take that on notice, Senator.

(.....)

Senator LAMBIE: Were only members of the Australian Defence Force either observing or participating in this resistance to interrogation training, or are there personnel from other government agencies present as well during this resistance to interrogation training?

Lt Gen. Campbell: I will have to take that on notice. I am just not aware of the answer to that question.

Answer:

Resistance to interrogation training is referred to as Conduct After Capture and is voluntary training.

Number of courses:

Army has conducted 33 Conduct After Capture 72-96 hour practical activities since 2001. The breakdown is:

- 2015: 4
- 2014: 2
- 2013: 1
- 2012: 2
- 2011: 1
- 2010: 2
- 2009: 5
- 2008: 4
- 2007: 4
- 2006: 1
- 2005: 3
- 2004: 0
- 2003: 2
- 2002: 1
- 2001: 1
- 2000: 0

Personnel numbers:

The number of personnel varies for each activity. On average there are 34 individuals undertaking training per activity since 2001. There are approximately 65 training, medical and support staff per activity.

Equipment:

For operational security reasons and for the wellbeing of our special forces, Defence will not discuss these matters.

Costs:

On average an activity in 2015 cost approximately \$55,000 per activity. Additional costs are incurred if the activity is remotely conducted in Queensland. The average cost of an activity conducted in Western Australia for the Special Air Service Regiment is \$100,000. The average cost per trainee is approximately \$1,250.

Women:

Females have participated in Conduct After Capture exercises.

Allegations of Assaults:

In addition to the recent allegations concerning Trooper Evan Donaldson, Army is aware of one Defence Abuse Response Taskforce case referred to Army that is related to Conduct After Capture training, noting that at the time of the alleged incident, the training was known as Resistance to Interrogation.

Storage of Recordings:

There are thousands of hours of recordings of Conduct After Capture training at an average of 960 hours of footage per activity.

The recordings are used to record an individual's behaviour and to confirm that individuals undergoing the activity were not mistreated during the training. They are also used as examples of behaviour for Conduct After Capture trainers during their training. The recordings are not used for any other purpose.

Observers and Participants:

Only Australian Defence Force personnel observed and participated in the training.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Budget Estimates - 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Conduct After Capture Training

Question reference number: 16

Senator: Lambie

Type of question: Spoken - asked on Wednesday, 10 February 2016, Hansard p.33

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) Does the resistance to interrogation training comply with international conventions against torture? Is the Australian Defence Force in breach of the Geneva Convention Against Torture?
- (b) How do you know that, and have you had it independently assessed?
- (c) In a later discussion with Deputy Chief of Army, Major General Rick Burr (Hansard p.74), Senator Lambie stated: You may recall that I asked: does the RTI training comply with international conventions against torture and is the Australian Defence Force in breach of the Geneva Convention against torture? And how do you know and have you had it independently assessed? I believe your reply was that the Army had received legal advice which essentially gave the all-clear for this type of exercise to be carried out. I just want to clarify: did the Army receive legal advice which essentially gave the all-clear for this type of exercise to be carried out?
- (d) Senator Lambie: "I am asking that question because I would also like to see the legal advice that you obtained and have it tabled."

Answer:

- (a) The ADF does not conduct activities that involve torture.

The ADF conducts Conduct After Capture training which provides guidance and in some cases, practical training, regarding methods and techniques used to survive captivity to select ADF members who are identified as being at risk of capture by foreign or enemy forces.

The relevant international conventions that deal with the prohibition on acts of torture are the *Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment* and the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*, both of which Australia is signatory to. Australian domestic law reflects the prohibition on torture in various criminal law provisions.

Conduct After Capture Training is mandated to be conducted according to strict protocols and guidelines. These protocols and guidelines comply with Australia's international legal obligations, and Australian domestic law.

- (b) The ADF's methods for its Conduct After Capture Training have been legally reviewed by a Senior Reserve Legal Officer.
- (c) and (d) Legal advice is subject to Legal Professional Privilege.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Trade Missions – Roberts' Involvement

Question reference number: 17

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 35

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

Senator CONROY: I want to move onto a different trip. Does the Department of Defence organise trade missions?

Mr Richardson: I am not aware of us organising trade missions.

Senator CONROY: They could be delegations of businessmen that we can call anything we want. Do you provide support? Do you provide—

Mr Richardson: For instance, we certainly do get involved in air shows. Every two years, you have the big event down in Avalon, outside of Melbourne.

Senator CONROY: This would be a delegation leaving Australia to visit other countries.

Mr Richardson: No, I am just saying, we get involved in matters of that kind. I think, from time to time in the past, there would have been occasions when ministers have been accompanied by business leaders in their portfolio area of responsibility. And that is not unusual.

Senator CONROY: This is the Assistant Minister for Defence. Has Mr Robert led any such delegations?

Mr Richardson: I would need to take that on notice.

Senator CONROY: Could I get information on any that Mr Robert conducted that you can find in this period?

Mr Richardson: Yes, we can provide that.

Senator CONROY: Could I get indication on the dates of them?

Mr Richardson: Yes, we can provide you with those details.

Senator CONROY: On the names of the people accompanying him?

Mr Richardson: I will take advice on that, but I see no reason why that could not be provided.

Senator CONROY: I will await your response. Where they travelled too?

Mr Richardson: Yes.

Senator CONROY: I am particularly interested in one that possibly went last year in around April, possibly to the UAE or possibly to Washington, if that helps narrow the—

Mr Richardson: Okay.

Senator CONROY: Are you familiar with the Washington trip?

Mr Richardson: If we are thinking about the same trip, the answer is yes, but I do not know what trip you are thinking about.

Senator CONROY: I am thinking about the trip that I think a ministerial press release was put out on a few days after the minister's return. I would be surprised if you did not know, but you did indicate that you do know. Given that I have been more specific, do you have a list of the delegation that went with Mr Robert? I am not sure if it went to the UAE and Washington or just to Washington.

Mr Richardson: I will take that on notice, but I think we would probably have a copy of that.

Senator CONROY: In particular, I want to know whether Mr Paul Marks was on that delegation. Does that ring a bell?

Mr Richardson: I have read the name in the newspapers over the last few days.

Senator CONROY: How do people qualify to go on these trips? Are they funded by the government? Do they pay for themselves? What was the process for this trip?

Mr Richardson: I cannot answer in respect of this particular trip; I need to take that on notice. In the past, it has varied, but I think, more often than not, the businesspeople pay for their own travel.

Senator CONROY: I will come back to that and, hopefully, a little later, before or after lunch, we can get a list of those. In terms of the processes of how these are put together—who puts them together? Does the department say, 'Look, we think you should lead the delegation'? Does the minister? What is the process for creating a delegation like this?

Mr Richardson: I have seen a variety of processes. I have seen officials suggest such a delegation to a minister and to a Prime Minister—that is, in the context of a prime ministerial or ministerial visit abroad. I have seen departments suggest, 'What about a trade angle to it?' I have seen ministers and Prime Ministers initiate their own suggestions. In terms of the attendees or the people accompanying a Prime Minister and a minister, I have seen departments have inputs and I have seen departments not have inputs.

Senator CONROY: Are you aware of how this trade delegation—if we could just use that phrase; it could be officially called something else—was created? Do you know whose idea it was or who put the program together? I am assuming the department put the program together. Were invitations issued by the department? Did the minister or assistant minister provide the names and say, 'These people should come on a delegation'? How did that work for this Washington delegation?

Mr Richardson: I will take that on notice, Senator.

Answer:

In April and May 2015, then Assistant Minister for Defence, the Hon Stuart Robert MP traveled to the United Arab Emirates (UAE), Iraq and the United States (US).

Travel to the UAE and Iraq: 24-26 April 2015

Minister Robert visited the UAE and Iraq over 24-26 April where he met with deployed Australian Defence Force personnel and Australian's then Ambassador to Iraq, and attended an ANZAC Day service with ADF personnel in Baghdad. The Department of Defence coordinated the UAE and Iraq portion of Minister Robert's visit. Minister Robert was accompanied by the Commander of Joint Task Force (JTF) 633, JTF 633 staff, Minister Robert's chief of staff and aide-de-camp. In accordance with the Government's Parliamentary travel policy, costs associated with travel to the Middle East for Minister Robert, and Minister Robert's chief of staff were the responsibility of the Department of Finance. Costs relating to the aide-de-camp, including flights, meals, incidentals and accommodation, were paid for by the Department of Defence.

Travel to the US: 26 April – 7 May 2015

Minister Robert visited the US between 26 April to 7 May where he participated in Defence related calls, took part in official engagements and participated in an Australia-Israel Chamber of Commerce trade mission. Minister Robert's official party included his chief of staff and aide-de-camp. Costs relating to the aide-de-camp, including flights, meals, incidentals and accommodation, were paid for by the Department of Defence. Support, including logistics for the Official Program involving Minister Robert, his chief of staff and aide-de-camp was provided by the Australian Embassy in Washington. Accommodation for Minister Robert and his chief of staff while in the US was funded by the Australian-Israel Chamber of Commerce. Travel costs for Minister Robert and his chief of staff for the Trade Mission were funded by the Australian-Israel Chamber of Commerce.

US Official Program

As noted above Minister Robert participated in a number of Defence related calls during his visit to the US, which are tabled at Table A.

The Australian Embassy in Washington DC provided support for Minister Robert's logistics (ie. travel) for his Defence related calls. The Australian Ambassador to the US accompanied him on his Defence calls at the Pentagon and Australia's Head of Defence Staff accompanied him to all other Defence related calls. Minister Robert and Australia's Head of Defence Staff along with other Embassy staff, and the members of the trade mission, participated in a wreath laying ceremony at Arlington National Cemetery.

US Trade Mission

The Australian-Israel Chamber of Commerce was responsible for setting up and administering the trade mission program, participants and associated logistics for Minister Robert's visit to the US. The Department holds a copy of a list of the trade mission participants, provided by the Australian-Israel Chamber of Commerce, which is provided at Table B.

Funding for the trade mission was managed by the Australian-Israel Chamber of Commerce. The Australian Embassy in Washington DC assisted the trade mission to meet US requirements for security related to US defence industry facility visits. Australian Embassy staff also accompanied the trade mission on a tour of the Capitol Building. Minister Robert's Office Assistant was not part of the Official Program and Defence understands that her participation in the Trade Mission was self funded.

Table A, official program provided by Australian Embassy Washington

Sunday 26 April 2015	Ambassador The Hon Kim Beazley hosted a welcome reception for Minister Robert and the Australia-Israel Chamber of Commerce trade mission. Australian Embassy staff also attended the event
Monday 27 April 2015	Call with the US Assistant Secretary of Defence Research and Engineering (Washington D.C.)
Monday 27 April 2015	Wreath laying at Arlington Cemetery (Washington D. C.)
Monday 27 April 2015	Call with the National Security Research Laboratory (Washington D.C.)
Monday 27 April 2015	Call with Defence Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) (Washington D.C.)
Monday 27 April 2015	Call with the US Navy Research Laboratory (Washington D.C.)
Monday 27 April 2015	Call with the Defence Information Systems Agency (DISA) (Fort Meade Maryland)
Wednesday 29 April 2015	Call with US Special Operations Command (Tampa, Florida)
Friday 1 May 2015	Call with Sikorsky Helicopters (Houston, Texas)
Saturday 2 May 2015	Call with Lockheed Martin (Dallas / Fort Worth, Texas)
Wednesday 6 May 2015	Visit to RAAF personnel conducting Unmanned Aerial Vehicle training at Creech Airforce Base (Nevada)

Table B, list of trade mission participants provided by the Australian-Israel Chamber of Commerce

Company	Title	First Name	Surname
Australian Government	Assistant Minister for Defence	Stuart	Robert
Office of The Assistant Minister for Defence	Office Assistant	Helen	Lewis
DJ Capital	Managing Director	John	Margerison
Acache	Managing Director	Alok	Patel
Australia-Israel Chamber of Commerce	CEO	Simon	White
Office of The Assistant Minister for Defence	Chief of Staff	Robert	McKellar
Office of The Assistant Minister for Defence	Aide-de-Camp	Matthew	Fahey
Trident Group	Managing Director	Perry	Dollar
Trident Electronics	Manager	Jared	Bezuidenhout
Malmar	Managing Director	Dave	Turner
Magnetica	CEO	Richard	Aird
Holmwood Highgate	Managing Director	Wade	Mellish

Company	Title	First Name	Surname
UNSW Canberra	Professor	Michael	Frater
Deloitte	Partner	David	Milo
Deloitte	Partner	Scott	Alexander
Deloitte Capland Real Estate advisory	Partner	Damian	Winterburn
Adagold Aviation	Managing Director	Mark	Clark
HP	Head of Strategic Engagement	Martin	Clarke

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: OKRA – Air Operations

Question reference number: 18

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 38

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator CONROY: On average, how many missions are we flying daily or weekly? I appreciate the point you just made, that we have just been through a very intense period, so it may be that the averages are a little distorted at the moment.

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: I will take that on notice to give you the breakdown and the rate of effort, noting that it is not quite the rate of effort we worry about; it is more the effect that they have when they are on task.

Senator CONROY: Are you aware of any reports that our assets have been fired upon while undertaking operations since last estimates?

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: I am not aware of anyone being fired upon, but, as I explained last time, anyone can pick up a rifle and shoot. Is it possible? Yes, but I am not aware of that. I will take that on notice just to confirm that for you.

Answer:

Between 8 October 2014 and 28 February 2016:

- Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF) fighter aircraft flew 623 strike missions (each consisting of 2 x F/A-18 aircraft) over Iraq and Syria, releasing 941 weapons. Each mission was around 7.6 hours endurance.
- RAAF E-7A Wedgetail Airborne Early Warning and Control aircraft flew 195 command and control missions over Iraq and Syria. Each mission was around 12.3 hours endurance.
- RAAF KC-30A Multi Role Tanker Transport aircraft flew 566 air-to-air refueling missions over Iraq and Syria, offloading 45,806,871 lbs (approximately 20.8 million kg) of fuel to coalition aircraft. Each mission was around 8.0 hours endurance.
- No Air Task Group aircraft were reported to have been fired upon.

Sentate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: NZ residents and ADF Recruitment

Question reference number: 19

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 38

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator REYNOLDS: I have a question which is possibly a little out of left field. I am very happy for you to take it on notice. It relates to an issue that has been brought to my and to some colleagues' attention. It relates to the eligibility of some categories of New Zealanders who live here permanently who are currently ineligible to enlist, either when they have gone through cadets or directly into the ADF. I understand the substantive issue is one for the Minister for Immigration and Border Protection because it relates to visa 444. The issues that have come to my attention and to some of my colleagues' attention are in relation to the aspect of Defence enlistment. What I hope you will take on notice are some of the circumstances surrounding that. As we have a look at this issue further, we can then see if we cannot find some solutions so that those New Zealanders, particularly those who may have been one year old when they came here, can have a pathway to serve in the ADF. Could you specifically take on notice issues such as whether you are aware of the issue, how recruiting deals with the process and at what point of the enlistment process what advice is given to those seeking to enlist but who are rejected. I have had varying numbers of how many people might be impacted. Do you keep records of how many people have been rejected on those grounds? Do you have any advice about what would be required, from Defence's perspective, to consider enlistment or make enlistment and service possible? That is the issue.

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: In fact, what you have just said shows the complexity of the issue that we have, especially for someone who was born—or who was one year old when they came to Australia. We will take it all on notice because we can explain out the complexities and where it sits. But in simple terms, at the moment unless you are an Australian citizen or going through the process to be an Australian citizen you cannot join the Australian Defence Force. Likewise, I cannot join the New Zealand Defence Force because they have the same issue, although it is probably not as much of a problem going that way as going this way. But it is something that does affect a number of people. I know—I see the letters come through. If we take it all on notice for you then we can provide a fairly detailed answer

Answer:

The Department of Defence is aware of the matter raised by Senator Reynolds.

It is longstanding policy that only Australian citizens may serve in the Australian Defence Force (ADF). Defence may seek to change the visa status of an individual who has the skills needed by the ADF if such skills are not available in Australia. All persons who enter the ADF via a visa pathway must satisfy Australian citizenship requirements and become citizens.

If applicants do not hold Australian citizenship or permanent residency, they are informed that they are ineligible to join the ADF at the point of application. Defence figures indicate that approximately 65,000 ADF enquirers withdraw their enquiry (or fail to progress it) per annum; however, fewer than 0.1% of these are attributable to their New Zealand citizenship. On the rare occasion where an applicant is considering a role where there are insufficient applications by Australian citizens, the applicant may be progressed following Service consideration of a waiver, but only where the applicant is already a permanent resident prepared to pursue citizenship.

The Prime Minister and the Minister for Immigration and Border Protection announced on 19 February 2016 a streamlined pathway to Australian citizenship for many Special Category Visa holders who have been living in Australia for at least five years. The new pathway will be available from 1 July 2017 but will not necessitate a change to the policy on ADF citizenship requirements. In summary, as matters stand, the best way forward for a New Zealand citizen to be able to join the ADF would be for them to become an Australian citizen.

Any person who wishes to join the ADF should contact Defence Force Recruiting and they will be advised of the eligibility requirements for service during the recruitment process.

Senate Standing Committee of Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence Enterprise Agreement Bargaining Sessions

Question reference number: 20

Senator: McEwen

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 44

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator McEWEN: There was a bargaining session in the week of 18 January and there was one more recently—is that right?

Mr Richardson: I do not know whether it was the 18th. Ms Skinner might have the precise answer.

Ms Skinner: I will need to confirm the exact dates of the bargaining that was held in January. We did hold our final rounds of bargaining last week, on 2 and 3 February.

Answer:

A round of bargaining for the Defence Enterprise Agreement was held on 19 and 20 January 2016. A further round of bargaining was held on 2, 3 and 4 February 2016.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Data Item Descriptions

Question reference number: 21

Senator: Xenophon

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 29

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator XENOPHON: Tell me the significance of the data item description. The definition of 'data item description' I have from this thing called Wikipedia says it is 'a completed document defining the data deliverables required of a defence contractor'.

Rear Adm. Sammut: That is a fairly accurate description. It defines the information that is required to be submitted in response to a request.

Senator XENOPHON: So it would define the data content, the format and the intended use of the data in the context of a contract or a project?

Rear Adm. Sammut: That is correct.

Senator XENOPHON: In order to have a proper procurement process, you need to have those defined parameters of the DIDs?

Rear Adm. Sammut: That is correct.

Senator XENOPHON: So a DID is significant?

Rear Adm. Sammut: Part of the CEP approaches that we made to the participants included data item definitions.

Senator XENOPHON: And data item descriptions or definitions—

Rear Adm. Sammut: Descriptions.

Senator XENOPHON: My understanding of the definition is that data item descriptions are used in government contracts because they form the basis of any contract. Correct?

Rear Adm. Sammut: That is correct.

Senator XENOPHON: You said that you sought clarification in respect of a number of things, but could you confirm the number of DIDs? How many DIDs are there? How many data item descriptions are there currently in respect of the CEP?

Rear Adm. Sammut: There are in the order of 20 data item descriptions that define the information—

Senator XENOPHON: Is it 20, 21 or 19?

Rear Adm. Sammut: I believe there are 22 data item descriptions that define the information that we are seeking. I will confirm that, just to make sure that we did not define one particular deliverable from the participants as a DID. But it is of that order.

Answer:

There are 20 Data Item Descriptions under the Competitive Evaluation Process (CEP) contracts with DCNS and TKMS. The contents of these Data Item Descriptions are reflected in CEP documentation under the Government-to-Government arrangement governing Japan's participation in the process.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: OKRA – Lessons Learned

Question reference number: 22

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 53

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

Senator CONROY: I also understand we are now on our second rotation of ADF personnel as part of the task group. What lessons have been learned from the first rotation?

Answer:

Key lessons from the deployment and conduct of the Building Partner Capacity mission, by Task Groups TAJI-1 and TAJI-2, as part of Operation OKRA, have been identified and acted upon in preparation for follow-on rotations 3 and 4.

Many of the key lessons identified and remediation actions being undertaken to rectify them are of a classified nature. The following table provides a range of unclassified examples of lessons learned and Army's follow-up actions.

Serial	Theme	Lessons Identified
1	Force Preparation Training	<p>The Task Group TAJI-1 pre-deployment period allowed Headquarters Staff Officers to meet their New Zealand counterparts and commence building operating procedures and relationships.</p> <p>Based on this observation, New Zealand troops from TAJI-2 and TAJI-3 were flown to Australia to participate in pre-deployment training and commence integration before deploying to Iraq.</p>

Serial	Theme	Lessons Identified
2	Cultural Training	<p>The cultural awareness package in pre-deployment training was observed to be effective but can be refined with the benefit of Task Group TAJI-1 personnel informing subsequent pre-deployment training.</p> <p>Based on feedback, trainers and advisors from Task Groups TAJI-2 and TAJI-3 received scenario based training by ADF staff with previous Iraq training team experience and the Training Task Unit Commanding Officer and key staff returned from Task Group TAJI-1.</p> <p>TAJI-1 personnel delivered cultural advisor and vignette training to Task Group TAJI-3 Training Advisors and personnel.</p>
3	Arabic Language Training	<p>A number of training team personnel in Task Group TAJI-1 observed that they would have benefited from undertaking additional language training prior to deploying.</p> <p>Additional language training was included in the preparations for TAJI-2 and TAJI-3. Improvements have been made through the involvement of Australian Iraqi Arabic native speakers.</p> <p>Headquarters 1 Division published an Iraq Advisor Aide-Memoire including Iraqi Arabic phrases. The 'useful phrases' of the Memoire is in the process of being updated based on feedback from returning Task Group TAJI personnel.</p>
4	Working with Interpreters	<p>Building relationships was reported as critical to working effectively with interpreters.</p> <p>In addition to the Headquarters 1 Division Iraq Advisor Aide-Memoire, the dedicated training topic Working with Interpreters has been modified by 39 Operational Support Battalion as part of Advisor Force Preparation Training and will include recently returned veterans from Task Groups TAJI-1 and TAJI-2 to provide performance mentoring whilst training.</p>
5	Health	<p>Task Group TAJI-1 health elements recommended that sanitation practices be emphasised and enforced during pre-deployment training in order to develop muscle memory of hygiene practices and mitigate the spread of illness, such as gastroenteritis, in-theatre.</p> <p>Specific medical issues were communicated to the Headquarters 1 Division Senior Medical Officer for distribution to the ADF unit supplying medical support and these medical precautions were emphasised on pre-deployment training.</p>

Serial	Theme	Lessons Identified
6	Coalition Standard Operating Procedures	<p>On arrival in-theatre it was determined that the Nine-Line Casualty Evacuation Proforma used in training was slightly different to the Coalition Proforma. This was rectified immediately in theatre and Pre-deployment training was modified to ensure that the amended Nine-Line Casualty Evacuation Proforma was used.</p>
7	Training Iraqi Forces	<p>Trainers from Task Groups TAJI-1 and TAJI-2 have observed that while mission specific training provided a sound base for working with indigenous Iraqi Forces, the key to operating with Iraqi Forces is flexibility.</p> <p>Using feedback from Commanding Officer TAJI-1 and his key staff, Headquarters 1 Division modified delivery of Advisor force preparation training provided for Task Groups TAJI-2 and TAJI-3 by 39 Operational Support Battalion to include the use of interpreters, building relationships and trust, motivating Iraqi Forces and assessing operational training level and experience.</p> <p>Feedback from the recently returned Task Group TAJI-2 indicates that pre-deployment preparations for the TAJI training mission continues to improve in relevance and realism based on the previous rotations' experience.</p>

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: OKRA - Training

Question reference number: 23

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 54

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator CONROY: I assume the Special Operations Task Group has completed its draw-down to about 80 personnel?

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: I think we discussed this last time as well. We initially had up to 200. They were doing a lot of the CTS training in Baghdad as well as mentoring and advising and assisting the operational forces. In putting the BPC mission into Taji we assessed the draw-down, remembering the initial period that the SOTG was announced to have been in there for; we looked to draw them down but we wanted to make sure that we were continuing to stand behind the success of 1st ISOF Brigade. The difference between when we first went in and when we considered what they needed to do was that other nations had started to put special forces into Baghdad as well. NATO SOF had put in forces. There are other countries now coming in to do that basic training, and so we focused on more the up-end side and also putting more into the support of the operations so they could have the agility on the battlefield to fight and win.

Senator CONROY: So we are down to our 80?

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: About 80.

Senator CONROY: How many personnel do they train at a time? Is it one for one at this high level or is it one for 10, one for 20?

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: I will have to take that on notice, and I will not have that specific stat but I will be able to give you the numbers of people that they have trained, just in raw figures. They have qualified over 836 Iraqi CTS soldiers in range and combat skills, and in my opening address I talked about a lot of the operational support that they have given them. They are also taking some of these forces as they come off the front line back in for additional training before they then go back out again.

Answer:

The Special Operations Task Group Advise and Assist instructor-student ratios are designed to suit the nature of the training being conducted and the availability of students, instructors and resources.

The instructor-student ratios can be increased or decreased commensurate with the training task.

Additionally, one Australian Defence Force member is exclusively assigned as Force Protection over-watch for each training session and is not involved in any training duties.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Executive Office Upgrades

Question reference number: 24

Senator: Bilyk

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Have the furniture, fixtures or fittings of the Secretary's office, or any Deputy Secretaries, been upgraded since 20 October 2015? If so, can an itemised list of costs please be provided?

Answer:

Secretary of Defence

- Nil

Deputy Secretary CASG

- New 55" inch television for the Deputy Secretary CASG Office – supplied 24 November 2015.
- Total cost: \$1,749.00 incl. GST

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Special Purpose Aircraft – KC-30A

Question reference number: 25

Senator: Bilyk

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

I refer to the answers to Chamber QoNs 2769 and 2770 asked by Senator Jacinta Collins, in relation to whether the Turnbull Liberal Government was considering acquiring KC30A aircraft to serve as new VIP aircraft for the Prime Minister.

Senator Collins was advised: *“Project Air 5402 is valued at \$1.820 billion (MYEFO 15/16) to acquire the KC-30A Multi-Role Tanker Transport Fleet of five aircraft with training devices, support systems and qualification. In June 2015 an additional two aircraft were approved and a contract change implemented at a cost of approximately \$408 million”*

- (a) What role is the Defence Department playing in the acquisition of new VIP aircraft for the Prime Minister?
- (b) Is it correct that the KC30A is a version of the Airbus A330 aircraft?
- (c) Are you able to advise whether the two additional aircraft approved last year were specifically for service as the PM’s VIP aircraft? Does the \$408 million represent the anticipated costs of acquiring those 2 private jets for Mr Turnbull? Are you able to confirm the anticipated costs?
- (d) Was the current or former Prime Minister or their offices consulted about the acquisition of these aircraft?
- (e) What role is the current Prime Minister’s office playing in the project?
- (f) What role did the former Prime Minister’s office play in the project?
- (g) Who is responsible for deciding upon the configuration of the aircraft and the fitout of the interiors? Is it the Prime Minister, his office, the Defence Department or the Defence Minister?
- (h) An article published in Fairfax newspapers on 29 November 2015 available online at <http://www.smh.com.au/interactive/2015/Shirtfronted> reported that the Prime Minister’s office (or former PM Abbott’s office) was responsible for the configuration of the aircraft: *“When Assistant Defence Minister Stuart Robert asked then Air Force Chief Air Marshal Geoff Brown for an update on the refit of a KC-30 jet so it could serve as a VIP plane for the Prime Minister, he was told it had been taken out of the hands of the Air Force. Credlin was personally designing the reconfiguration, he discovered”*
 - (i) Is that report accurate?

- (ii) Has responsibility for the design of the Prime Minister's new private jet returned to the Defence Department or does it remain with the Prime Minister's office?
- (iii) Are you able to advise when the Prime Minister's new private jets are expected to enter service?
- (iv) What stage is the project at currently?
- (v) Can any schematics or design specifics of the refit, and any illustrations or photographs be provided?

Answer:

- (a) Defence is not buying new VIP aircraft. Defence is managing the modification of a KC-30A tanker to support a long-range Government Transport and Communications capability.
- (b) Yes.
- (c) Defence is not buying private jets. Nor is it buying "two additional aircraft ...specifically for the service as the PM's VIP aircraft".

Two additional KC-30A aircraft were specifically bought to expand the existing fleet of five air-to-air refueling aircraft, as informed by the Force Structure Review and articulated in the Integrated Investment Program. The additional aircraft were required to support the growing demand for in-flight refueling. As the KC-30A is a multi-role aircraft it can be used for cargo and passenger movements as well as its primary role of air-to-air refueling. This concept of a multi-role fleet is not new for Defence, and is in line with similar roles undertaken by the B707 Tanker aircraft.

- (d) Government was consulted as part of the White Paper process.
- (e) Refer to (d).
- (f) Refer to (d).
- (g) Defence. However, Government's early guidance was that modifications were to be modest and kept to the minimum required, that they not impact upon the primary role of the KC-30A (which is air-to-air refueling), that existing interior equipment, such as seating, be reused where possible and that the layout facilitates the continuance of Government business whilst in transit.
- (h)(i) Defence is not aware of such a conversation.
- (h)(ii) It remains with Defence.
- (h)(iii) They are not private jets, but are air-to-air refuelers which meet an important capability need.
- (h)(iv) The additional KC-30A aircraft have commenced air-to-air refueling modifications and are due for completion in 2017.
- (h)(v) No.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Shipbuilding – Supporting Infrastructure

Question reference number: 26

Senator: Reynolds

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 62

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator REYNOLDS: On notice, can you give me a further breakdown of what work is currently underway and where that mapping is in terms of short-, medium- and long-term requirements with the shipbuilders themselves and all of the support around them—the trades required for the build. As the secretary said, you have different levels of skill required for the different ships, but, also, for sustainment and maintenance. There is some crossover, but again there are some differences in those. Could you provide more information about the process, the trades that you are identifying and also what work has been done to identify the workforce around the nation—and, perhaps, where some of the gaps are, as I am sure there will be gaps in visibility. I think it would be useful for us to start to have a look at where the gaps are and how we fill them. Also, from a Western Australian perspective, if there are going to be prospective jobs in Western Australia, what can we do, in a civilian sense, to try and encourage other industries to keep the trades there for any future sustainment and maintenance work, or make other jobs in other states more visible to them, so that, as a nation, we keep the skill sets. So, if you do not mind taking those on notice, I would be grateful.

Mr Baxter: I am very happy to do that.

CHAIR: Your question, Senator Reynolds?

Senator REYNOLDS: Yes. If there are going to be projects, if a certain tender is successful, this is what the support and the infrastructure would need to be in location which could help inform earlier some of the infrastructure projects for roads, housing and the ports in location down there as well. Now, how we do that is another thing. But if you could take on notice if there is a way that we can—Vice Admiral Barrett, did you have a comment on that?

Vice Adm. Barrett: I am agreeing with you, Senator, in that this is a national endeavour and it is not constrained purely to the delivery of the platform. It is really about the infrastructure that is put in place so that we can sustain that capability for its entire life whilst we also consider the build after next, because continuous build is just that—not a series of individual projects that follow each other but a capability that you have built beyond just the ships themselves that allows you to give certainty to industry but also then give certainty to the capability manager that those ships will be delivered and can be operated in the right place.

Mr Gillis: One of the things we are already finding is that there are limitations on existing facilities on wharves and hardstandings. The air warfare destroyers are being limited—the flow-through of those vessels. If and when we do go to a continuous shipbuilding process, the facilities are going to be absolutely critical, and working with the states is also going to be critical, to ensure the facilities are up to scratch when we actually start.

Senator REYNOLDS: So my question on notice, Chair, is: is there a way, looking forward, that these discussions can start to foreshadow things with state governments now so that they can influence and perhaps impact on their longer term infrastructure projects so that we do not get to the point where you want to implement some of these—

Senator Payne: Yes, of course—absolutely.

Senator REYNOLDS: Thank you. That is the question.

Answer:

As outlined in the 2016 Defence White Paper, Defence has committed to a long-term continuous build of surface warships. State and territory governments will be engaged during the development of detailed planning.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Macroeconomics Report Contract Cost

Question reference number: 27

Senator: McEwen

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 66

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator McEWEN: Then, in another answer to a question that I asked at the last estimates, it says that Defence commissioned Macroeconomics to prepare a model for assessing the economic impact of major Defence capital et cetera and submarines, and that contract was for \$395,000. Is it the same contract we are talking about or is this an additional contract to the original Macroeconomics report?

Rear Adm. Sammut: Could you refer me to the question on notice that we responded to?

Senator McEWEN: It was in answer to Senator Conroy's question reference No. 76. And to a question on notice, after supplementary budget estimates on 21 October 2015, where the preamble to the question said that the original contract with Macroeconomics was for a report into the effect on the economy of building submarines in Australia, the cost was \$459,000 for a report to be delivered by 30 June 2014. When I asked some follow-up questions to that question on notice, also during the October estimates, the answer was, 'In mid-2013, Defence commissioned consulting company Macroeconomics', et cetera 'to help the department prepare a model'—which you have been talking about—'suitable for assessing the economic impact of major Defence capital equipment.' The consultancy contract for that was \$394,676 including GST. That was extended in 2015 by a further \$96,780. I am just curious. Are we talking about two separate contracts or—

Rear Adm. Sammut: No, I believe we are talking about one contract and there was an extension for the work to be done.

Senator McEWEN: But there is quite a difference between the original 2012 contract of \$459,000. Then, in answer to my question on notice in mid-2013, the department commissioned Macroeconomics to prepare the model that you have been talking about, but the cost of that contract was \$394,000 and that was extended in 2015 by a further \$96,780. I am trying to clarify whether we are talking about \$459,000, plus \$394,000, plus \$96,780 or is \$394,000 part of \$459,000?

Rear Adm. Sammut: I believe it is the latter.

Senator McEWEN: Can you check that and get back to us?

Rear Adm. Sammut: Yes, I will check it.

Senator McEWEN: Also, has there been any further extension beyond 2015 to the consultancy contract for the model? Have there been any payments subsequent to the 2015 payment of \$96,780?

Rear Adm. Sammut: There have been some further payments to refine the model, but not through Macroeconomics, who are no longer involved. Their work has been completed in developing the model to a certain point. We have done further development of the model and that has involved some supplementary funding.

Senator McEWEN: How much was that?

Rear Adm. Sammut: Can I take that on notice?

Senator McEWEN: And who was it paid to?

Rear Adm. Sammut: Yes.

Senator McEWEN: And when was it paid?

Rear Adm. Sammut: Yes.

Senator McEWEN: How long will we have to wait for the information about whether or not we are talking about three separate sums of money paid to macroeconomics?

Rear Adm. Sammut: We will take that on notice and provide our responses as soon as possible.

Senator McEWEN: Thank you.

Answer:

The payments to which Senator McEwen refers are all associated with the same research project. The project aims to develop a model of economic impact appropriate for large scale Defence capital equipment projects and apply this to submarine construction.

In mid-2013, the Department of Defence contracted the consulting company Macroeconomics to help the Department prepare a model suitable for assessing the economic impact of major Defence capital equipment projects including a potential submarine build. The original contract value was \$459,840; however, the work was completed at cost of \$393,675.

In early 2015, the research project was extended to take into account emerging issues and the availability of additional data. This work was undertaken at a cost of \$96,780 paid under separate contracts with Victoria University and Deloitte Access Economics.

In the second half of 2015, a further extension was made to the research project to include modeling to support the Future Submarine Program Competitive Evaluation Process and additional issues and data relevant to submarine construction emerging from early-2015 onwards. The budget for this work is \$276,950 payable under new contracts with Victoria University, Cadence Economics, and Professor Des Nichols. Of this budget, \$114,537 has been expended.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Macroeconomic Peer Review

Question reference number: 28

Senator: Fawcett

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 66

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator FAWCETT: Coming back to the modelling, you are probably aware that there have been many discussions around economic impact of large defence projects. I understand that the perspective of the Department of Finance, and today the Defence department, is that they do not take into account second-order or spillover effects and quite often the projects that are quoted are relatively low-tech projects. But this committee and others in the parliament have received a fair bit of evidence that, for highly complex projects where there is a lot of problem-solving to be done, spillover effects can be measured and are significant. In fact, RAND confirmed that. Can you just inform us: does the modelling that you are using include any aspects of spillover or second-order effects?

(.....)

Rear Adm. Sammut: But there are three broad types of models, I understand, that are used to look at economic impact: an input-output model, which I tend to understand Professor Roos has used; a macro time series model; and another model that we call a computable general equilibrium model. The work that we have done in developing the model that we would use to inform government has considered all of those approaches and what is the most balanced way of representing the economic impact by looking at spillovers and looking at a number of other things that go into assessing impact at the end of the day.

Senator FAWCETT: Does the order of the impact under your modelling compare with what RAND has indicated they believe surface ship-building—is it of the same order of magnitude?

Rear Adm. Sammut: We have not completed the modelling yet, so I cannot answer your question directly. It will depend on what results come out based on what the inputs are into the model at the end of the day.

Senator FAWCETT: Have you sought to verify the model by going back and looking, for example, at the Air Warfare Destroyer project or even maybe Collins?

Rear Adm. Sammut: We used Collins to help us verify the form of the data, so there has been a validation and verification process. The model has also been peer reviewed and consulted appropriately within areas to ensure that it represents a balanced view of the economic impact and does not overemphasise unduly any one particular factor.

Senator FAWCETT: Are you able to let the committee know who did the peer review?

Rear Adm. Sammut: Can I take that on notice?

Senator FAWCETT: Sure.

Answer:

The peer review for the economic modeling work has been undertaken by Professor Philip Adams of Monash University and then Victoria University (working in the first instance through Macroeconomics), Deloitte Access Economics, Cadence Economics, Professor Henry Ergas (working through Deloitte Access Economics and Cadence Economics), and Professor Des Nichols of the Australian National University.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates - 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Animal Testing

Question reference number: 29

Senator: Rhiannon

Type of question: asked on Wednesday, 10 February 2016, Hansard page 68

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator RHIANNON: I understand that the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons, when they run early management of severe trauma courses, use live animals to teach emergency medical procedures to ADF personnel. Is that correct?

Vice Adm. Griggs: That is my understanding in certain very limited and specified conditions. I will get Commander Joint Health to give you the details.

Air Vice Marshal Smart: Sorry, Senator: could you repeat the question again?

Senator RHIANNON: I understand that the Royal Australian College of Surgeons, when they run early management of severe trauma courses, use live animals to teach emergency medical procedures to ADF personnel. I was asking whether that was correct, and I was just informed that it was, so I will go on to the next question. Are you aware that the US Department of Defense issued a new policy, effective from 1 January last year, stating that 'suitable simulation alternatives can replace the use of live animals' in the training, and ordered the entire US military to end animal use in favour of simulation? Are you aware that that is the situation with the US military? And has that had any impact on the situation with the ADF?

Air Vice Marshal Smart: I am afraid I will have to take that question on notice.

Answer:

Defence is aware of the discussion surrounding the US Department of Defense Memorandum for the use of simulation in preference to live tissue training from 1 January 2015. Defence has sought a copy of the current Directive and is awaiting a response from the US Department of Defense. The ADF continues to utilise non-live tissue simulation as a preference where this meets the needs of our ADF personnel; however, for the severe trauma courses simulation is not currently an option.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates - 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Animal Testing – US DOD Policy

Question reference number: 30

Senator: Rhiannon

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2015, Hansard page 151

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator RHIANNON: Am I correct in understanding from that evidence that you are saying that as well as courses in severe trauma run by the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons courses run by other institutions, say, universities—and I would be interested in what the institutions are—also would be maybe using live animals to teach ADF personnel? So, it is not just the RACS?

Air Vice Marshal Smart: There are several courses—the emergency management of severe trauma course, the definitive surgical trauma course, and some other training as well. The College of Surgeons is one of the providers, but there is also the International Association for Trauma Surgery Intensive Care. Some of those courses are delivered through Australian universities, yes.

Vice Adm. Griggs: We can get you, on notice, the full details of that, if that would help.

Senator RHIANNON: Yes, and if those details could include whether live animals are used in those courses. Is the ADF—considering the US context with the US Department of Defense issuing that new policy, and also considering how you determine your own policies on these issues—taking steps to immediately require, or to require in the future, all early management of severe trauma courses that your personnel undertake to be taught with non-animal simulation models?

Air Vice Marshal Smart: If there are non-animal simulation options available to deliver the type of training that we need our people to have, then they will always be taken. The types of courses we are talking about are ones for which there is not a simulation option available at the moment.

Senator RHIANNON: Could you provide the committee with the details of what animals are used in this teaching and how many of each species?

Vice Adm. Griggs: We will do that as part of that response that we undertook earlier to give you about the different courses; we will put that into the detail of that response.

Senator RHIANNON: For each of the different institutions you engage with—thank you.

Answer:

The Emergency Management of Severe Trauma (EMST) course uses four sheep per course in the live tissue training scenarios. The Royal Australasian College of Surgeons (RACS) conducts four EMST courses per year for the ADF. The animals are deeply anaesthetised prior to any interventions and are euthanised, without regaining consciousness, at the end of the training.

RACS is the only institution used by the ADF for provision of severe trauma training.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Operation Gateway

Question reference number: 31

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 69

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator CONROY: I would like to discuss Operation Gateway. Could you provide an overview of the history of this operation and its current purpose, mission and areas of operation?

Senator CONROY: Other than what you have described, is there a succinct way to say that this is their mission or this is their role—a precis, a couple of sentences?

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: There will be an exact mission statement, and I will have to get that for you.

Answer:

Operation GATEWAY is Australia's enduring contribution to the preservation of regional security and stability in South East Asia.

The Operation GATEWAY maritime surveillance patrols operate from Royal Malaysian Air Force base – Butterworth. The patrols occur in the North Indian Ocean, Malacca Strait, Andaman Sea, Gulf of Thailand and South China Sea.

The first patrol occurred in February 1981, with the purpose being to monitor the movement of Soviet ships and submarines passing through the South East Asian region. However, with the end of the Cold War in 1989, Operation GATEWAY was amended to encompass a broader maritime surveillance role.

In addition, Operation GATEWAY patrols also contribute to the bilateral Defence relationship between Australia and Malaysia.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Operation GATEWAY - Flight Challenges

Question reference number: 32

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 71

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator CONROY: Which countries are challenging our flights? Is it just China or do the Philippines and Vietnam, to pick two others, or any other countries— **Air Chief Marshal Binskin:** I will take that one on notice. I know it is China, but let me just check because, as you know, there are five different claimants from for many of those islands, and while China is changing the status quo and building quite large features there are other features out there that actually do have people on them. If I can take that on notice I will be able to give you a more detailed answer on that.

Senator CONROY: Just from your general knowledge, is it China—

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: It is predominantly China.

Senator CONROY: If you find it is anyone else let us know, otherwise we will work on the assumption that it is China.

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: Yes.

Senator CONROY: If possible, I am interested in seeing the trend data. On notice, could Defence please write a summary of how many sorties have been conducted each year for the past five years in the South China Sea under Operation Gateway, and how many of those sorties have been challenged by another country, and by which country.

Senator Payne: I am not sure that is something we are in a position to put on the public record in that way.

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: I will have to have a look at that.

Senator CONROY: I am happy for you to take it on notice.

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: We will take it on notice.

Answer:

In the five years between 2011 and 2015, a total of 30 Operation GATEWAY deployments have been conducted. The numbers of Operation GATEWAY deployments have increased from six in 2011 to eight in 2015.

The operational demands for maritime surveillance aircraft assigned to operations in the Middle East and to Operation RESOLUTE have decreased, enabling the Royal

Australian Air Force to slightly increase the number of Operation GATEWAY deployments conducted.

The number of flights per deployment varies depending on the length of the deployment and number of assets assigned to each deployment. Approximately two-thirds of Operation GATEWAY flights are conducted in the South China Sea, but this could change as it is subject to operational requirements.

During 2014 there were a total of four challenges received. During 2015 a total of 42 challenges were received. Of these 46 challenges, 41 were received from Chinese vessels/ground stations, three from Vietnamese vessels/ground stations and two from Japanese vessels/ground stations.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Budget Estimates, 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Seaward Village Security Risk Assessment

Question reference number: 33

Senator: Gallacher

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 125

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator GALLACHER: Thank you. Now, if we go to the security assessment, at supplementary estimates on 21 October 2015 we were told by the Chief of Army: I am advised that the security risk assessment of Seaward Village resulted in Defence Security and Vetting Service recommending security design principles for incorporation into the redevelopment and concluding that, subject to the adoption of these principles, it had no basis on which to recommend Defence rejects the Seaward Village redevelopment.

(.....)

Senator GALLACHER: Okay. In preparing the assessment, with whom did the Defence Security and Vetting Service consult?

Mr Grzeskowiak: I do not have that information, Senator.

Senator GALLACHER: You do not have it. And cannot get it?

Mr Grzeskowiak: I am sure we can take the question on notice and have a look.

Answer:

Defence Security and Vetting Service consultation included Army (SASR), Defence Estate and Infrastructure Group, Western Australia Police and the Australian Federal Police.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates - 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Question reference number: 34

Senator: Lambie

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 77

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016.

Question:

Major Gen. Westwood: I do not have a file on him. I have some working notes from my time as counsel assisting the board of inquiry 16 years ago. I have called up from archives the court martial proceedings against him, and I have some very isolated pieces of correspondence in connection with the request for the transcript of the court martial.

Senator LAMBIE: Could you please table those. And has Colonel Carlin ever been—

CHAIR: Excuse me, Senator Lambie; we will just get a response to your question from Major General Westwood.

Major Gen. Westwood: I would be happy to table the correspondence with Mr Saltmarsh. This is in connection with his request for the documents. In connection with my working files for the board of inquiry, it would not, in my view, be appropriate to table those. The release of the board of inquiry itself is a matter for ministerial discretion. So far as my working notes and so on are concerned, there will be issues of legal professional privilege in connection with my dealings with the board, and there are probably also various privacy issues.

Answer:

In accordance with the response provided to Senator Lambie's question at the Additional estimates hearing on 10 February 2016, attached are redacted copies of the following documents:

- Mr Saltmarsh's letter dated 1 March 2006 (Attachment A);
- MAJGEN Westwood's response dated 7 March 2006 (Attachment B); and
- Emails sent on MAJGEN Westwood's behalf on 8 March 2006 and 16 March 2006 (Attachment C).

The redactions relate to the details of Mr Saltmarsh's address, personal number, email address and mobile telephone number on the basis that MAJGEN Westwood considers the release of this information to be an unreasonable disclosure of personal information within the provisions of s.47F of the Freedom of Information Act.

Mr Marcus Saltmarsh
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

01 MAR 06

BRIG I WESTWOOD
Chief Judge Advocate
RG Casey Building
Barton ACT 2600

Dear Brigadier Westwood,

I request access to all information regarding my Court Martial, reference the death of CPL Stuart Jones on Operation Tanager, East Timor on 9 AUG 2000.

I request information including but not limited to;

1. The report of the Court Martial of [REDACTED] PTE M.O. Saltmarsh and the Court Martial findings and recommendations.
2. Copies of witness statements, proof of evidence, expert opinions or reports, copies of all correspondence, opinions, including complete transcripts of proceedings of my prosecution in relation to the death of CPL Jones.
3. I request copies of all correspondence between COL. Ian Westwood and Mr Richard Tracey QC in relation to BOI findings, reports, opinions and recommendations for disciplinary action against myself.
4. Copies of all correspondence, reports, media releases, press statements and briefing notes relating to contact between the ADF and media services, regarding any matter relating to the Death of CPL Jones, the Board of Inquiry or my prosecution in relation to his death.
5. Copies of all internal ADF correspondence relating to public relations issues generated by the death of CPL Jones. I also request all internal ADF correspondence relating to the establishment of my Court Martial in relation to the death of CPL Jones.

I request this information so I may make a submission to the Inspector General of the Australian Defence Force regarding the Conduct of the Board of Inquiry into the death of CPL Stuart Jones on Operation Tanager in East Timor on 09 AUG 2000, the subsequent findings of the BOI, recommendations made by the BOI and media issues relating to the BOI.

I have already requested information through the Freedom of information act, however this has been unsuccessful. I have been advised by the Directorate of Administrative Law to seek the above information from you, and additional information regarding the BOI from Rear Admiral Moffit, DCJOPS, HQJOP.

All hard copy information should be forwarded to me via the above address.

Should you have any questions regarding my request, please contact me on the following e-mail address;

[REDACTED]

or alternatively on mobile number;

[REDACTED]

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M Saltmarsh', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Marcus Saltmarsh



OFFICE OF JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL
Chief Judge Advocate

Department of Defence, RGC-2-28, CANBERRA ACT 2600

2003-24045
CJA 041/06

Mr Marcus Saltmarsh
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Dear Mr Saltmarsh

REQUEST FOR COURT MARTIAL PROCEEDINGS

1. I refer to your letter dated 1 March 2006. The original proceedings before the Restricted Court Martial (RCM) have been archived and there will be some delay while they are obtained. However, in the meantime, I have sent an electronic of the transcript (together with an electronic copy of this letter) to your e-mail address. In addition to the transcript, the original proceedings will include the convening order and the documentary exhibits. The exhibits are identified in the transcript. Perhaps, when you have had an opportunity to see the transcript, you would indicate whether you wish to have a copy of the documentary exhibits or whether the transcript is sufficient for your purposes.

2. The copy of the record of the proceedings before the RCM is released pursuant to Defence Force Discipline Act s.195.

3. So far as your request for the Board of Inquiry and other material is concerned, I note that the Freedom of Information section of the Defence Legal Service wrote to you by letter 2005/1053961/1(77) dated 21 December 2005 and that Ms Frey, of the Directorate of Administrative Law communicated with you by e-mail dated 1 March 2006 outlining the options available to you.

Yours sincerely

I. D. Westwood

I.D. WESTWOOD
Brigadier
Chief Judge Advocate
RGC-2-28

Tel: (02) 6266 8813; Fax: (02) 6266 8969

7 March 2006

Mackenzie, Jennifer MS

From: MacKenzie, Jennifer MS
Sent: Thursday, 16 March 2006 7:20
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: REQUEST FOR COURT MARTIAL PROCEEDINGS [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Have now corrected the errors in the zipped files. Hopefully they will open now.

Regards

Jennifer Mackenzie
CJA Paralegal

-----Original Message-----

From: MacKenzie, Jennifer MS
Sent: Wednesday, 8 March 2006 09:48
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: REQUEST FOR COURT MARTIAL PROCEEDINGS [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

Dear Mr Saltmarsh,

I have written to you in reply to your letter of 1 Mar 2006. An electronic copy is attached, together with an electronic copy of the transcript of the proceedings of your trial by RCM.



Letter to Saltmarsh
- Mar 06 s...



Saltmarsh PTE - 16 Saltmarsh PTE - 12
Nov 01.pdf ...



Nov 01.zip ...



Nov 01.zip ...



Nov 01.zip ...



Nov 01.zip ...

If you cannot open the transcript files (zipped) could you please let me know.

Yours sincerely,

Ian Westwood

I.D. WESTWOOD

BRIG

Chief Judge Advocate

Department of Defence

RGC-2-28

CANBERRA ACT 2600

Tel: 02 6266 8812

Fax: 02 6266 8969

E-mail: jennifer.mackenzie@defence.gov.au

IMPORTANT: This e-mail remains the property of the Australian Defence Organisation and is subject to the jurisdiction of section 70 of the Crimes Act 1914.

If you have received this e-mail in error, you are requested to contact the sender and delete the e-mail.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Stuart Roberts – Official Dinners – Washington Trip

Question reference number: 35

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 80

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator CONROY: I would find it unusual, if the Assistant Minister for Defence was meeting some senior figures, that the relevant Defence official was not in Washington for that. That would be unusual. What else would have been a higher priority for the official than looking after the Assistant Minister for Defence at some fairly high-level meetings?

Mr Richardson: I do not at this point have knowledge of the details of Minister Robert's program beyond the official calls.

Senator CONROY: Were there any official dinners there?

Mr Richardson: I would need to take that on notice; we can certainly get that for you.

Answer:

The then Assistant Minister for Defence, the Hon Stuart Robert MP, travelled to the United States from 26 April until 7 May 2015 where he took part in an Australia-Israel Chamber of Commerce tour and held Defence related calls.

On Sunday 26 April, Ambassador The Hon Kim Beazley hosted a welcome reception for Minister Robert and the Australia-Israel Chamber of Commerce trade mission. Australian Embassy staff also attended the event.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates - 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Pacific Maritime Security Program - Aerial Surveillance

Question reference number: 36

Senator: Whish-Wilson

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 81

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator WHISH-WILSON: I have a couple of questions about aerial surveillance of illegal fishing. Last year the international policy division did not renew a contract with Central Pacific Special Air Service, who were using Cessna aircraft to conduct an aerial surveillance over a 10,000 square kilometre region, from the east coast of Australia out to the seas of Kiribati. Can I ask what the reason was for not extending the contract?

(.....)

Mr Baxter: As I said, it was a trial that we conducted. We gained sufficient information in the 12 months of the trial. The proposed extension of the contract would have resulted in a significant cost increase to the government, and we decided that the information we had was sufficient for the purposes that we were going to apply it to, which was to design an aerial surveillance component to go with the rollout of the new Pacific patrol boats, which will start in around 2018.

Senator WHISH-WILSON: In terms of how you funded that, can you give us an idea of the internal budget that you had set aside for those aerial surveillance operations?

Mr Baxter: I would have to take that on notice to give you the exact contract figure.

Answer:

Under the Department's 12-month contract with Central Pacific Special Air Services (CPSAS) to trial maritime aerial surveillance in the South Pacific, CPSAS was required to provide maritime aerial surveillance to Pacific Island Countries at a cost of A\$378,972 in Financial Year 2014/15. This was funded from within the existing Department of Defence budget, under the Defence Cooperation Program.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates - 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Pacific Maritime Security Program – Pre Palau Costs

Question reference number: 37

Senator: Whish-Wilson

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 82

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator WHISH-WILSON: Thank you for clearing that up. Is the Pacific Maritime Security Program, which conducts maritime patrols, slated to provide Palau with an aerial surveillance package?

Mr Baxter: At the moment we are still designing the package, but certainly Palau has accepted our offer of a new Pacific patrol boat. Subject to negotiations, we would expect that Palau will be a full participant in that program.

Senator WHISH-WILSON: Can you outline what those costs are expected to be for that program?

Mr Baxter: It is still in development. We obviously have costs for the Pacific Patrol Boat element itself because it is subject to a tender process, but the other elements of it are still under development.

Senator WHISH-WILSON: Could you say how much the program was before the aerial surveillance was proposed for Palau?

Mr Baxter: I can give you that figure, but I would have to take it on notice.

Answer:

At the 2015 Pacific Islands Forum in Papua New Guinea, the former Prime Minister, the Hon Tony Abbott MP announced additional funding of AUD19 million per year for the aerial surveillance and regional coordination components of the Pacific Maritime Security Program.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates - 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Afghanistan - Oruzgan Province

Question reference number: 38

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 91

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator CONROY: Can we clarify whether any of the district centres that fall under control or under influence? Could you take that on notice and come back to us?

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: I will take that on notice, so I am making sure I am matching up our definition with John Campbell's. I will put on record that our assessment is that the other district centres remain under government control, in that sense.

Senator CONROY: Can we confirm whether any of Oruzgan's districts are among the 94 district centres that General Campbell said were assessed as at risk? There are three metrics.

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: I will have to take that one on notice.

Senator CONROY: If you could break it down for me—

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: I will break it down for you.

Senator CONROY: I am happy to pause there.

Answer:

Questions relating to the metrics used by the Resolute Support mission to characterise security in Afghanistan should be referred to the mission (contact details at <http://www.rs.nato.int/contact-us.html>).

While Defence officials regularly discuss assessments of the security situation in Afghanistan with North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) and other partners, Defence does not disclose the substance of these discussions. However, Defence's security assessments are broadly consistent with NATO sources.

Defence's assessment is that the Taliban did not intend, nor had the capacity to capture and hold Uruzgan Province in its entirety in 2015. However, Afghan government control was eroded in 2015.

The provincial capital of Uruzgan, Tarin Kowt, and other district centres remain under Government control. However, insurgents have increased their freedom of movement in some outlying rural districts including southern Deh Rahwood, Char Chineh/Shahid-e Hasas, Chora and Khas Uruzgan.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Supply Ships Tender – Evaluation Completion

Question reference number: 39

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: asked on Wednesday, 10 February 2016, Hansard page 102

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

Senator CONROY: Thank you. Unfortunately I am probably going to go over a little bit of the same ground as Senator Xenophon did, so my apologies for that in advance. I did want to start with the tender for Navy's new supply ships. On 6 June 2014, the then defence minister, Senator Johnston, announced a limited tender for the supply ships, with construction to occur in either Spain or South Korea. On what date did the limited tender process open?

(.....)

Senator CONROY: And the shipyards and companies involved Navantia and Daewoo. I assume they have a proven track record in producing these ships on time and budget?

Mr Richardson: Yes.

Senator CONROY: I think you indicated that final bids have been received back on 7 August?

Mr Richardson: Yes.

Senator CONROY: What was the evaluation process following the receipt of the bids?

Senator Payne: It is a normal tender process.

Mr Richardson: It just followed the normal tender process of evaluating the two tenders in technical evaluation working groups, separating the finances from the technical components before bringing them together. It was the normal process that we would undertake in any large acquisition.

Senator CONROY: Except submarines and apparently frigates. When did Defence conclude its assessment of the bids?

Mr Gillis: I would have to take that on notice.

Answer:

The tender process was completed on 5 May 2016.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Budget Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Supply Ships Tender – Ministerial Advice

Question reference number: 40

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: asked on Wednesday, 10 February 2016, Hansard page 104

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

Senator CONROY: Minister Payne, when you were asked in question time by Senator Cameron on 4 February 2016 to explain the time the Abbott-Turnbull government has taken thus far with the supply ships tender, you said: These are contracts of very significant complexity. They are commissions of very significant complexity. The government will take the time that is required to make the correct decision, and the decision will be made in due course. Could you explain what makes a contract to buy two supply ships based on an existing, proven design from a proven shipyard a contract 'of very significant complexity'?

Senator Payne: Not unreasonably, the government takes the view that any significant acquisition process within the ADF—and this is a significant acquisition process—comes with a degree of complexity. I adverted to that in my response. That requires the appropriate considerations through, in this case, the tender process and, as I indicated, a decision will be made in due course.

Senator CONROY: But it has been described as urgent. Due course does not sound like you are treating it very urgently.

Senator Payne: The process is still underway. A decision has not yet been made, but it will be made.

Senator CONROY: The process has been completed and you have a recommendation sitting on your desk.

Senator Payne: The process within government is still underway.

Senator CONROY: You have a recommendation on your desk.

Senator Payne: I did not notice you in my office earlier this evening. I said the—

Senator CONROY: I think the department have indicated that they passed it up to you.

Senator Payne: The process within government is still underway and a decision will be made when that is completed.

Senator CONROY: You have had it for over two months—a minimum of two months.

Senator Payne: I am not sure that is correct, actually.

Mr Richardson: I do not think that would be—

Senator CONROY: Before Christmas was—

Senator Payne: I do not think that is correct.

Mr Richardson: No. I stand to be corrected, but I think Mr Gillis said the evaluation process was completed before Christmas. That is quite different to the formal consideration moving forward to government.

Senator CONROY: Unfortunately, I think you were engaged in a side conversation.

Mr Richardson: Yes, but I think—

Senator CONROY: What I asked was: has Defence provided advice seeking a formal decision from government on the successful tenderer, and the answer was yes.

Mr Richardson: Yes, that is right.

Senator CONROY: And then I asked when and he said, 'Before Christmas.' That is two months that they have passed up their advice—

Senator Payne: I am not sure that is right.

Mr Gillis: I will have to take that on notice because I do not specifically have the date. You just asked me for a general view. You said, 'Was it roughly this or that?' and I said—

Senator CONROY: No, I said, 'Before Christmas?' and you said, 'Yes.' You cannot change your answer. I asked you twice and you agreed that it was before Christmas. So the formal process has passed through to the minister.

Senator Payne: I will check that, but I do not think that is the precise timing.

Senator CONROY: Is there another stage that I am unaware of?

Senator Payne: No. I do not think that is the precise timing; I will check that. But, as I said to you, the process is still underway and the government will make a decision.

Mr Richardson: Mr Gillis will check, but I am fairly certain that it did not go to government prior to Christmas. I think it was subsequent to Christmas, in 2016—

Senator Payne: That is my recollection.

Mr Richardson: that it went forward.

CHAIR: You will confirm that on notice.

Mr Richardson: Yes, we will, but I am fairly certain the minister has not had it since before Christmas.

Mr Gillis: And, Senator, if I was incorrect, I apologise.

Senator CONROY: No, I happily accept that you may have made a mistake.

CHAIR: It will be resolved once you have given it to us on notice.

Answer:

The decision to select Navantia as the preferred tenderer for the supply ships (SEA1654 Phase 3) was taken by the appropriate Defence delegate on 10 November 2015.

Defence notified Navantia and Daewoo of the outcome of the initial request for tender evaluations on 8 March 2016.

Defence then undertook Offer Definition Improvement Activity/Negotiations with the preferred tenderer, Navantia.

The Defence Capability and Investment Committee considered the final documentation that would be presented to Government seeking Second Pass approval on 10 March 2016.

Second Pass approval for SEA 1654 Phase 3 was provided by the Government on 17 April 2016.

On 5 May 2016, Defence signed Acquisition and Support contracts with Navantia for the design, build and initial five years of in-service support.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: FOI Disclosure – PM's Catering Profile

Question reference number: 41

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 117

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

Senator CONROY: I would like to ask some questions about a document relating to the Prime Minister that was published on the FOI disclosure log of the Department of Defence. It was a copy of the Prime Minister's dining preferences when travelling on board his VIP aircraft. Curiously, the entire catering profile has been redacted. On what national security, commercial-in-confidence basis are the dining preferences of the Prime Minister—

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: I assume it is a privacy issue, but we will have to take that on notice.

Senator CONROY: Is the FOI officer in the room?

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: No, you did not actually tell us you were going down that path, so we will have to—

Senator CONROY: On what legal basis were those exemptions justified?

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: In fact, in an FOI response it would have actually said why, I would imagine. But I do not have it with me.

Senator CONROY: Was the Prime Minister consulted about the proposed release under the FOI Act of the details of his dining preferences?

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: We will have to take that on notice.

Senator CONROY: Did Mr Turnbull object to the release of this information?

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: [inaudible].

Senator CONROY: Was Mr Turnbull consulted?

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: I cannot answer that. I will have to take that on notice. I cannot answer it right now.

Senator CONROY: Did Mr Turnbull object to the release of the information? What happens if people get to object—

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: If you would give us that list we will take that on notice and provide whatever response we can.

Senator CONROY: Did the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet provide the Prime Minister, his office, or Mr Turnbull with any assistance in responding to the Department of Defence in relation to these consultations?

Senator Payne: We cannot answer on behalf of the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet.

Senator CONROY: I am asking whether or not they assisted in responding to the Department of Defence in relation to these consultations? If it came through—

Senator Payne: That will be taken on notice.

Senator CONROY: Was the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet or the Prime Minister's office represented by external lawyers in this consultation with the Department of Defence, and if so, which firm?

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: External lawyers? For food?

Senator CONROY: I cannot understand why it has been redacted, so I am with you!

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: We will take that on notice.

Senator CONROY: Minister, were you involved in any discussions with the department about this FOI request?

Senator Payne: No.

Senator CONROY: Or your office?

Senator Payne: Not that I am aware of, no.

Senator CONROY: If you could check—

Senator Payne: Yes. I think the answer is no.

Senator CONROY: Did the Department of Defence have any communications with the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet about this FOI request?

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: We will answer that as part of the—

Senator CONROY: Can a copy of all correspondence in relation to this request between the Department of Defence and the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet and between the Department of Defence and the Prime Minister's office—which will be zero, on the basis of the evidence—please be provided to the Senate?

Mr Richardson: We will take that on notice.

Senator CONROY: As far back as I can remember it has been quite routine for the Prime Minister to release this information under FOI, so I am perplexed as to why all of a sudden it is not being released.

Senator Payne: We will follow that up.

Senator CONROY: For example, I located copies of VIP dining preferences for former Prime Minister's Tony Abbott and Kevin Rudd. So both of their preferences were on the public record. In fact, they are on the Department of Defence FOI disclosure log. I see that Mr Abbott and Mr Rudd had no objection to the release of their dining preferences under FOI. So, Minister, again, why will the Prime Minister not release his dining preferences?

CHAIR: I think the question has been taken on notice.

Senator CONROY: I am asking the minister.

CHAIR: The minister has already indicated to you she will take that on notice.

Senator Payne: I did take that on notice.

Senator CONROY: Is he subject to the same rules everybody else?

Senator Payne: Of course. I said I would take it on notice.

Senator CONROY: Why would he think he is above the rules?

Senator Payne: I am sure he does not.

Senator CONROY: What does he think it is more private than previous prime ministers do?

Senator Payne: I am sure he does not. I said I would take it on notice.

Senator CONROY: Does he have expensive tastes? Does he prefer French caviar on board? Does he prefer French champagne on board? What is he hiding?

Senator Payne: I think you are descending to the level of ridicule, and I do not think that is necessary.

Senator CONROY: I am just asking what the Prime Minister is hiding. Former Prime Minister's Abbott and Rudd both did not feel it was an invasion of privacy.

Senator Payne: I have said we will come back to you. I am not familiar with the particular FOI and I will come back to you.

Answer:

Access to the Prime Minister's and Mrs Turnbull's catering profile was denied on the grounds of personal privacy and endangering the physical safety of a person. For details, see the Department of Defence Freedom of Information (FOI) Disclosure Log (<http://www.defence.gov.au/FOI/Decisions/DisclosureLog.asp>) at 8 January 2016 under FOI No. 143/15/16. This contains both the original decision letter and the internal review decision letter.

Consultation was conducted through the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, as is the convention. There were no external lawyers involved in the process.

Correspondence relating to the consultation process is available on Defence's Disclosure Log at 16 February 2016 under FOI No. 196/15/16.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Leeuwin Barracks – Community Engagement

Question reference number: 42

Senator: Reynolds

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 131

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator REYNOLDS: Mr Grzeskowiak, I have a question on the proposed disposal plans for Leeuwin Barracks. Could you give the committee an update on the process and where it is up to. I understand that there is a consideration of a master plan going forward. Given that it is such an historic and iconic feature of East Fremantle, and in fact of Perth, there is increasing community interest and increasing angst about the future of it, not only for the military heritage—some good, some not very good—but also for Indigenous history in the local area. Can you give us an update on where it is up to.

(.....)

Senator REYNOLDS: On notice, would you mind providing a bit more detail in terms of the process, the time line and the community engagement that has been done and planned, because it is not only the local community there—it is very much an icon of Perth—but also a lot of the communities that are now getting involved in this are the veterans' communities, particularly the naval veteran communities, and they are obviously interested in the site as well. The other question—a very quick one—

Mr Grzeskowiak: I might clarify that I will take it on notice, but I will not be able to be very specific on time lines. There are a whole range of players and time lines will be—

Senator REYNOLDS: Maybe some more on the process. I understand that a master plan is being planned—

Mr Grzeskowiak: That is right—

Senator REYNOLDS: In terms of what the time frame for the master plan is, and the community engagement—how you are working with East Fremantle—any information that you can provide, with as much detail on the process as possible, would be very helpful.

Mr Grzeskowiak: I will give you some process information about the steps we have to go through.

Answer:

Defence disposes of surplus property in accordance with the *Commonwealth Property Disposals Policy*. The policy allows for off-market sales to other government entities, including State and Local Government. On 13 August 2015, Defence wrote to both the Western Australia State Government and the Town of East Fremantle (Council), seeking interest in an off-market sale; however, neither entity has pursued an acquisition. Defence intends to sell the site on the open market.

Defence is currently developing an agreement with the Council to enable both parties to undertake master planning for Leeuwin Barracks which will include community consultation. Defence has committed to an initial six month planning period, which may be extended. During this period the sale of the site will be on hold. The six month planning period will commence once Defence and the Council have finalised the agreement, which will outline the process for the master planning activity. The parties are seeking to finalise the agreement by the end of March 2016.

Defence intends to sell the property during the 2016-17 financial year; however, this is dependent on several factors including the relocation of Defence units currently at Leeuwin and approval from the Minister for Finance, Senator the Hon Mathias Cormann, noting the total value of the project is expected to be more than \$20 million.

There are no indigenous values over the property, nor is the site registered on the Commonwealth Heritage List.

Defence is aware of the community apprehension regarding the disposal of the site, including concerns regarding the protection of memorials. For this reason, Defence has included a clause in the Contract of Sale that protects the memorials.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Fremantle Artillery Barracks – Security Review and Provision of Staff

Question reference number: 43

Senator: Reynolds

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 132

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator REYNOLDS: Thank you; that would be very helpful. The other one is in relation to artillery barracks, also in Fremantle. I had a visit there late last year with Minister Chester. Many people do not know it is still there, but there is quite a brilliant Army museum in the facilities there. They have gone through a recent refurbishment. The trouble is we have this fantastic bit of Australian, particularly Western Australian, military history there—I think the displays rival some of the content of the War Memorial here—but because it is a Defence facility it has still got a safe base, so it is locked up and there are no permanent staff there. The City of Fremantle and others would very much like to have a security review to see if we can get the safe base reduced, or gone altogether, so that we could open it up, because there are no active Defence establishments working out of there. I think it would be wonderful not only for domestic tourists but also for international tourists, who are now coming into Fremantle on cruise ships. So would you mind taking that on notice as well and giving us an update. There were some local undertakings that they would have a look at that security review to see whether that has happened and whether it is possible for people to see what we have there.

Mr Grzeskowiak: I will take that on notice, and any offers from the City of Fremantle to provide staff to act as access control people for the visitors that might come would be gratefully received by Defence.

Answer:

Artillery Barracks is an historical Army Barracks and Museum located in Fremantle, Western Australia and is part of the Metropolitan Perth and Regional Sites (MPRS) Base. The barracks operates within the guidance of SAFEBASE, Security Plans and Defence Policy.

Artillery Barracks is manned by three Army History Unit Reserve Personnel and 130 volunteers. It is open five days per week from Wednesday to Sunday. One uniformed member is required to be present when the Museum is open.

The volunteers provide support by acting as guides. They also control access onto the site in accordance with security and museum management policy. Approximately 10 to 20 volunteers rotate through the site on any day. Current access control arrangements are managed through the support of these volunteers, who are managed in accordance with Defence policy for employing volunteers. Managing the volunteers does not incur a cost to Defence.

SAFEBASE levels for Defence are directed by the Deputy Secretary Strategic Policy and Intelligence and cannot be removed or reduced at the Base level. The Chief of Joint Operations will determine if a change in SAFEBASE alert levels will have a material impact on the Australian Defence Force (ADF) operations overseas and the operational posture of the ADF. The National Threat Assessment remains High. The recent Security Risk Assessment for MPRS, which Artillery Barracks operates within, identified a range of security risks supporting retention of existing security arrangements. Removing or reducing SAFEBASE security requirements would not alter the way Artillery Barracks and the Museum is currently managed as the equipment and displays would still require the same level of security control, governance and accountability.

Operational arrangements at Artillery Barracks are similar to other tourist sites within the Fremantle precinct such as the Fremantle Prison, which only allows guided tours at regular intervals. Like Artillery Barracks, the Fremantle Prison does not permit uncontrolled access. Of approximately 11,000 visitors to Artillery Barracks per year, 80% of visits are made through bookings. Many school groups visit Artillery Barracks, with some groups as large as 120 children. The museum also allows 'walk up' visitors which account for approximately 20% of visits. Access by 'walk up' visitors is limited to two times each day – 10:30am and 1:30pm, which assists with maintaining control of the site.

Senate Standing Committee Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates - 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Board Vacancies

Question reference number: 44

Senator: Bilyk

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

(1) Please provide a list of all statutory, board and legislated office vacancies and other significant appointments vacancies within the portfolio, including length of time vacant and current acting arrangements.

Answer:

(1) Please refer to Attachment A.

Attachment A

Board Name	Legislated Office Vacancies	Other Significant Appointment Vacancies	Length of Time Vacant	Current Acting Arrangements
N/A	Inspector General ADF	Nil	1 since 22 December 2015	BRIG Jim Gaynor (Deputy IGADF Acting) <i>[as at 29 February 2016]</i>
Defence Honours and Awards Appeals Tribunal	1 x Member vacancy	Nil	1 since 6 July 2015	Nil <i>[as at 29 February 2016]</i>
Australian Strategic Policy Institute (ASPI)	Nil	5 x ASPI Council Directors	1 since January 2015 1 since April 2014 3 since December 2013	Not applicable. The ASPI Constitution requires a Council of three to 12 members. The current Council has seven members; therefore the board is functioning in accordance with the Constitution with no acting arrangements required. <i>[as at 29 February 2016]</i>

Woomera Prohibited Area Advisory Board	Nil	Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson	1 since 31 October 2015	Nil <i>[as at 29 February 2016]</i>
Australian Military Forces Relief Trust Fund	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil <i>[as at 29 February 2016]</i>
AAF Company	Nil	Board due to increase by two new Directors' positions in March	Nil	Nil <i>[as at 29 February 2016]</i>
RAAF Welfare Recreational Company	Nil	Two Board vacancies noting that one vacancy is dated 22 February 2016	One position vacant 11 months.	Nil. Action is underway to appoint suitable persons. <i>[as at 1 March 2016]</i>
Young Endeavour Advisory Board	Nil	Member	Six months	Nil <i>[as at 1 March 2016]</i>
Defence Industry Innovation Board	Nil	12	1 since March 2015	Nil <i>[as at 1 March 2016]</i>

Defence Housing Australia	2 x Commercial Directors	Nil	1 since 16 July 2015 1 since 23 November 2015	Ms Jan Mason has been in the position of Acting Manager Director since 2 November 2015 <i>[as at 4 March 2016]</i>
---------------------------	--------------------------	-----	--	---

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates - 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: HIV PrEP Use in the ADF

Question reference number: 45

Senator: McEwen

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

On 6 August 2015 the Australian Newspaper reported that the ADF was funding the supply of the pharmaceutical treatment Truvada to ADF personnel as an HIV prevention strategy (known as PrEP). The ADF stopped funding its supply in November 2015.

- (a) Over what period was the ADF funding access to PrEP for ADF employees?
- (b) How many ADF personnel were receiving support from the ADF to receive the treatment?
- (c) Were personnel receiving access to the treatment personnel serving overseas, domestically deployed personnel or both?
- (d) Why did the ADF decide, in the first instance, to finance access to the treatment for at risk personnel?
- (e) Does the ADF believe PrEP is an effective strategy to lower the transmission rate of the HIV virus amongst its personnel?
- (f) Are there instances of other drugs that the ADF has financed for ADF personnel that have not been through the full Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA) or Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme Advisory Committee (PBAC) process?

If yes:

- (i) Please provide a list of pharmaceuticals that the ADF has facilitated access to for ADF personnel prior to the finalisation of TGA and PBAC processes over the previous decade?

If No:

- (ii) Then why, did ADF decide to decide to facilitate access to a treatment that was subject to TGA consideration and subject to demonstration trials in the Australian community?
- (g) When the ADF decides to facilitate access to a drug that the rest of the community doesn't have access to under the PBS, does it consult with the Minister for Defence, or the Minister for Health and/or the Department of Health and / or the TGA?
- (h) Was the ADF's decision to stop financially supporting personnel from accessing PrEP prompted by the 6 August Australian Newspaper article?

If no:

- (i) Then what prompted the ADF's decision to stop financially supporting personnel from accessing the treatment?
- (i) Did the former Minister for Defence, Hon. Mr. Kevin Andrews MP, question the Defence Department's decision to facilitate access to the treatment?
- (j) Was Senator Hon Marise Payne, Minister for Defence, consulted on the decision to cancel financial support for the treatment?
- (k) Were there any representations from the Minister for Health or her office on this topic encouraging the ADF to rethink support for ADF personnel to access the treatment?

Answer:

- (a) May – October 2015.
- (b) Two Australian Defence Force (ADF) members.
- (c) The ADF members were not deployed or serving overseas during the period they were provided PreP.
- (d) In the absence of a specific Defence policy, a small number of ADF members were provided PreP in accordance with Defence off-label prescription approval processes.

The ADF members provided PreP were recommended and prescribed PreP by a specialist sexual health physician and managed in accordance with Australasian Society for HIV, Viral Hepatitis and Sexual Health Medicine (ASHM) clinical guidelines.

- (e) Based on international evidence, early results from the Australian demonstration trials and the recommendations of HIV medicine peak bodies, the ADF believe that PreP may be an effective strategy to reduce the risk of acquiring HIV infection in high risk groups as an augmentation to behavioural measures. The ADF position will be further informed by the outcomes of these trials and the subsequent decision of the Therapeutics Goods Administration on this matter.
- (f)(i) Defence is required to arrange for the provision of medical and dental treatment that is necessary to keep a member fit for the performance of the member's duties.

The Secretary of the Department of Health, through an instrument of delegation, has authorized specified medical practitioners to import, export or supply specified unregistered therapeutic goods for use in treatment. Commander Joint Health Command is responsible for reporting to Department of Health all authorisations granted by delegates.

For example, Defence has a list of Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) pharmaceutical countermeasures that are not Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA) approved and are managed under the Department of Health delegation. Each medication is considered by the Australian Defence Human Research Ethics Committee prior to approval by Commander Joint Health Command.

There are numerous examples of circumstances where ADF members may be provided TGA approved medications but not strictly in accordance with the TGA approved product information. These include instances detailed in the

Australian Immunisation Handbook, where the recommended frequency of vaccinations varies from the product information. On a case-by-case basis, usually based on specialist medical advice, members may be prescribed a TGA approved medication for an indication not listed in the product information. This is known as off-label prescribing. Where the requirement for off-label prescribing for a particular medication becomes more frequent, the circumstances are referred to the Defence Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee for consideration.

The Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme (PBS) is used as a guide to inform the ADF Formulary, however there are numerous medications that are not on the PBS but have been included in the ADF Formulary after consideration by the Defence Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee. Common examples include vaccinations and many formulations of the oral contraceptive pill.

- (g) The Defence Pharmacy and Therapeutics Committee oversees the Defence Formulary and provides advice on whether medications should be added or removed from the formulary. The committee membership includes representatives from the TGA and Department of Veterans' Affairs.

Defence does not access the PBS when providing medicines to ADF members.

- (h) *The Australian* article on 6 August 2015 prompted Defence to develop and issue a policy on PreP.
- (i) No.
- (j) No, the then Assistant Minister for Defence, the Hon Stuart Robert MP was advised of the decision on 7 September 2015. Senator Hon Marise Payne did not assume her appointment as Minister for Defence until 21 September 2015.
- (k) No.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: BioShield Act and Project - Australian Defence Force

Question reference number: 46

Senator: Reynolds

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- a) Is the Department of Defence aware of the United States BioShield Act and Project to acquire and stockpile medical countermeasures to biological, chemical, radiological and nuclear agents for military and civilian use?
- b) Is the Department aware that the US Department of Defence has procured medical countermeasures against these threats, including the threat of the possible re-introduction of the smallpox virus?
- c) Has the Department had any engagement with the US Government on the threat of the possible release of the smallpox virus and other biological threats?
- d) Does Australia maintain the same smallpox threat assessment as our allies?
- e) Is the Department aware that US defence and government personnel and front line civilians have been vaccinated against the possible reintroduction of smallpox?
- f) Is the Department aware of recent discussions within the French Parliament & Senate regarding the smallpox threat and the need for 3rd generation vaccine?
- g) What is the process for assessing the vaccine requirements for Australian Defence Force personnel engaged in overseas operations, particularly those personnel in and around a war zone?
- h) What precautions has the Department of Defence taken to ensure that ADF personnel are protected against current and potential threats biological and chemical warfare?
- i) Has the Department of Defence given consideration to protecting ADF personnel against new forms of biological and chemical warfare, and if so, what action has the Department taken to ensure that vaccines are available?
- j) What action has the Department taken to ensure that alternative vaccines are available for immunocompromised individuals?

Answer:

- (a) Yes, Defence is aware of the United States (US) BioShield Act. The Department is a signatory to a Memorandum of Understanding concerning the Research, Development and Acquisition of Chemical, Biological and Radiological Defence Materiel, with the Canadian Department of National Defence, the United Kingdom (UK) Ministry of Defence, and the United

States Department of Defense. Through the arrangement Joint Health Command is generally aware that the US Department of Defense procures countermeasures to a range of threats.

- (b) Defence is aware that the US procures a range of countermeasures, it is not aware if a smallpox countermeasure has been procured.
- (c) Through the mechanism of the Memorandum of Understanding concerning the research, development and acquisition of chemical, biological and radiological Defence materiel, the Department, through Joint Health Command, has engaged with the US, UK and Canada on the development of countermeasures to counter the threat of a possible release of some biological threats. Smallpox has not been part of this engagement.
- (d) Threat assessments are classified and we do not comment on other countries' threat assessments.
- (e) The US has a long-standing program of vaccination and information is publicly available:
 - Myopericarditis following smallpox vaccination among vaccinia-naive US military personnel. [The Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA). 2003]
 - US military smallpox vaccination program experience. [JAMA. 2003]
- (f) No
- (g) ADF personnel are routinely vaccinated for a range of common threats, similar to those provided to overseas travelers. This baseline requirement is determined by specialists within Joint Health Command and endorsed by the Surgeon General Australian Defence Force. In the case of specific deployments, health threat assessments are conducted utilising health intelligence from various sources. If there is a substantiated threat that can be countered via vaccination it would be considered by specialists within Joint Health Command.
- (h) If a threat is identified, personnel are trained and equipped to survive a chemical biological and radiological attack and elements within the deployed force will receive additional collective and specialist training, such as Detection Identification and Monitoring, warning and reporting and decontamination.

Health threat assessments are conducted when and where ADF Personnel are deployed. If a threat is identified, a countermeasure is available and there are no contraindications, Commander Joint Health Command/Surgeon General Australian Defence Force would authorise the administration of the countermeasure to the identified force element.

Defence takes its responsibility to protect the health of its military personnel seriously. ADF personnel being deployed are given a pre-deployment health briefing and personal protective equipment for the deployment.

The Department of Defence acknowledges the importance of developing new medical countermeasure products and identified this as a priority area of work

in the 2016 Integrated Investment Program (p 59) and in the 2016 Defence Industry Policy Statement (pp 32 and 70). In addition, and as stated in the Defence White Paper, “The Government will invest in a program for continuously improving the personal equipment soldiers use, including their ... self protection equipment (including for chemical, biological and radiological threats)” (page 97).

- (i) Defence Science and Technology Group have a productive and active research program into traditional and novel medical countermeasures against chemical and biological weapons. The Department is also a signatory to a Memorandum of Understanding concerning the Research, Development and Acquisition of Chemical, Biological and Radiological Defence Materiel, with the Canadian department of National Defence, the UK Ministry of Defence, and the US Department of Defense. Within this program a number of collaborative research projects and information sharing activities exist that centre on the research and development of new chemical and biological weapon medical countermeasures that includes inter alia vaccines. By virtue of our contribution to this program, the arrangement also facilitates the access to, and joint procurement of, medical countermeasures when required.
- (j) The Australian Defence Force does not deploy members who are immunocompromised. If it were ever necessary to provide biological or chemical warfare countermeasures to an immunocompromised individual, Defence would procure a suitable vaccine through the usual arrangements for such items.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: RTI Training – Variations and Content

Question reference number: 47

Senator: Lambie

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) Are there various types of Resistance to Interrogation (RTI) training sessions? For instance is there a training session for those to simulate capture under the Geneva Convention and a training session to simulate capture by a nation/group who operate without restrictions?
- (b) If so, what is the training session name and how many training sessions have been conducted?
- (c) What is the essential difference between such training sessions?
- (d) Please supply a table of content for the various RTI training sessions.
- (e) Please supply a list of Learning Outcomes of the various RTI training sessions.
- (f) Who conducts RTI training and what are their qualifications?

Answer:

- (a) Resistance to interrogation training is referred to as Conduct After Capture. Conduct After Capture Level C is the practical element of Conduct After Capture Training. Levels A and B are theory based. Level C is a 72 to 96 hour practical activity in which trainees demonstrate the skills, knowledge and attributes required to survive a capture situation.

Conduct After Capture Level C is designed to simulate detention by a group or organisation capable of operating within and outside the Geneva Conventions.

- (b) The name of the training is: 'Conduct After Capture Level C'.

Conduct After Capture Level C includes three modules: Foreign Government Detention, Military Exploitation and Hostage Survival. There have been 25 three-module Conduct After Capture Level C activities conducted since its introduction in 2006. In addition, one activity conducted in 2015 included Military Exploitation training only. This was at the request of the participating unit.

- (c) There is no essential difference between each Conduct After Capture Level C training session, with the exception of the aforementioned 2015 activity, for which the participating unit requested only the Military Exploitation element.
- (d) This information is sensitive and for official use only. If a threat force understood Australian Defence Force conduct after capture techniques and procedures, it would enable them to alter their tactics, techniques and procedures in order to improve their chances of successfully exploiting detained or captured Defence personnel. This could potentially pose a risk to the lives of Australian Defence Force personnel captured or detained in the future.
- (e) The current Conduct After Capture Level C Activity Learning Management Package has a single Course Learning Outcome: Comply with the Defence Code of Conduct After Capture. There are three subordinate Module Learning Outcomes:
- Understand the Defence Code of Conduct After Capture;
 - Receive exposure to threat interrogation and exploitation techniques, methodology and practices in a simulated hostile environment; and
 - Apply specific strategies and techniques used to defeat threat interrogation and exploitation.
- (f) The Defence Force School of Intelligence is the only Australian Defence Force unit authorised to conduct Conduct After Capture training. Only qualified Australian Defence Force Resistance Trainers are authorised to deliver Conduct After Capture Training. The current qualification criteria includes a suitability assessment, including psychological testing, and the successful completion of a five week Resistance Trainer's course covering all aspects of Conduct After Capture training.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Halal Ration Packs

Question reference number: 48

Senator: Lambie

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) Can we please be provided with the total cost to Government of:
 - (i) Development of the Halal ration packs
 - (ii) Quality assurance inspections of Halal ration packs
 - (iii) Codification and allocation of national stock number of halal ration packs
 - (iv) Upgrading the Military Integrated Logistics Information System (MILIS) to account for Halal ration packs
 - (v) The segregation, storage, transport of Halal ration packs during exercise and in times of war
 - (vi) Training of personnel of handling Halal ration packs
 - (vii) Potential legal costs and liabilities should Halal ration packs should be mishandled and wrongly issued
 - (viii) The upgrading of training management packages
- (b) Can the government please provide a breakdown by service, combat role, deployability status the number of members of the Australian Defence force who officially identify with the Islamic religion eg. Navy, Army and Airforce
- (c) Please describe the way the Islamic members of the military have been provisioned with Halal certified food in the past.

Answer:

- (a)(i) Nil. No halal ration packs have been developed.
- (a)(ii) - (vi); (viii) Nil.
- (a)(vii) Not applicable. No halal ration packs have been developed.
- (b) As at 21 February 2016, there were 103 Australian Defence Force permanent and Continuous Full Time Service members who have self identified as being Muslim (27 Navy, 56 Army and 20 Air Force). Of these, 73 are deployable (17 Navy, 39 Army and 17 Air Force).

The combat roles are contained in the table below:

Categories	Overall	Deployable
Air Technical	2	1
Any Corps	1	0
Armoured	4	2
Artillery	7	5
Aviation	4	3
Catering	1	0
Electrical and Mechanical Engineer	2	2
Engineer	1	1
Engineering	16	10
Finance	1	1
Force Protection & Discipline	3	3
Ground Technical	2	1
Health Services	1	0
Infantry	8	7
Intelligence	1	1
Intelligence & Information Systems	5	5
Logistics	3	3
Logistics & Admin	2	1
Medical	2	1
Medical Administration	1	1
Ordnance	11	5
Signals	10	8
Support Operations	2	2
Transport	4	4
Warfare	9	6
Overall Total	103	73

- (c) The current policy to cater for religious, cultural and medical conditions is to substitute ration components.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: ADF Policy and Sharia Law

Question reference number: 49

Senator: Lambie

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) Has the ADF have a policy of identifying members of the military who support the imposition/establishment of sharia law in Australia
- (b) Please describe the official policy imposition/establishment of sharia law in Australia
- (c) How many of the 100 members of the military who identify with the Islamic religion have indicated they support Sharia law
- (d) Does the ADF consider that an indication for support of Sharia law in its members is a sign of Islamic radicalisation

Answer:

- (a) No.
- (b) and (d) It is not the place of the Department to comment on such matters.
- (c) Not applicable.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: ADF Uniforms

Question reference number: 50

Senator: Lambie

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

In May 2015 I raised with the then Minister for Defence, Kevin Andrews, the withdrawal of Defence Materiel Organisation orders from the Workwear Group's factory in the Melbourne suburb of Footscray. I had met and stood with these highly skilled workers and their union the Textile Clothing and Footwear Union of Australia when they were fighting to save their jobs. These mainly migrant women had worked for many years making high quality uniforms that our soldiers have been proud to wear. Despite the efforts of these workers, their union and myself, the Government turned a blind eye and let this factory close. Eighty workers left without a job. Australia left with one less quality local manufacturer.

- (a) What is the current total annual amount spent on Australian Defence Force uniforms?
- (b) What percentage of those uniforms are made in Australia?
- (c) Let me be clear, I want to know what percentage are made by Australian companies but more importantly, what percentage of the uniforms are actually made here in Australia?
- (d) I want to know about the whole kit; combat uniforms, dress uniforms, day and exercise wear, shoes, boots, socks every bit of the uniforms we provide to our defence force and where it's made?

Answer:

- (a) \$72.365 million is to be spent on Australian Defence Force uniforms in the 2015-16 financial year.
- (b) Defence assesses that 57 per cent of the uniforms being purchased by Capability Acquisition and Sustainment Group in the 2015-16 financial year are manufactured in Australia.

- (c) Defence is bound by a non-discrimination clause in the Commonwealth Procurement Rules (CPRs) (clause 5.3) which states: “The Australian Government's procurement framework is non-discriminatory. All potential suppliers to government must, subject to these CPRs, be treated equitably based on their commercial, legal, technical and financial abilities and not be discriminated against due to their size, degree of foreign affiliation or ownership, location, or the origin of their goods and services.”

In 2011, the Government directed that the ADF ‘slouch hat’ and the Standard Combat Uniform are to be manufactured in Australia under an exemption to the non-discrimination rule.

All other ADF uniform items are subject to clause 5.3 of the Commonwealth Procurement Rules, and as such can be procured from overseas but are subject to value for money considerations.

All Australian Defence Force uniform items procured by CASG in the 2015-16 financial year are being purchased from Australian based companies. Of these items, 57 per cent is assessed to be manufactured wholly in Australia.

- (d) Capability Acquisition and Sustainment Group manages the procurement and sustainment of in excess of 21 000 line items of ADF clothing, which includes combat uniforms, non-combat uniforms and accoutrements.

In the 2015-16 financial year, the estimated percentage of uniform items to be made in Australia by category is:

- combat uniforms – 70 per cent
- non-combat uniforms – 32 per cent
- accoutrements, such as insignia, badges and rank – 45 per cent.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Resistance to Interrogation Training – Australian Military

Question reference number: 51

Senator: Lambie

Type of question: written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

- a) In the last 16 years did the Australian Military conduct an exercise (not a course) called Resistance to Interrogation or a similar name - run by defence intelligence organization - using SAS soldiers as subjects of interrogation?
- b) If these exercises occurred:
 - i. What number of Resistance to Interrogation exercises have been conducted each year for the last 16 years?
 - ii. What are the number of personnel on each of these exercise's?
 - iii. Please provide a list of all the equipment used and the total cost of each exercise?
- c) Were SAS soldiers the only subjects of interrogation used by the ADF on these Resistance to Interrogation exercises?
- d) Are the interrogation subjects past and present told that their ADF career may suffer adversely if they do not complete the Resistance to Interrogation exercise?
- e) Do the interrogation subjects receive a pass or fail noted on their service records for Resistance to Interrogation exercise participation?
- f) Were females present or allowed to participate on these Resistance to Interrogation exercises?
 - i. females were present can I have the total number of females in the past 16 years that have participated in the Resistance to Interrogation exercises?
- g) Is the Resistance to Interrogation exercise designed by medical professionals to deliberately undermine the mental health of the interrogation subjects?
- h) Have any of the interrogation subjects past and present been subjected to physical assaults prior to and/or as part of the Resistance to Interrogation exercise?
- i) Were Resistance to Interrogation subjects blind folded and or physically deprived of their sight throughout these exercises?
- j) Were the Resistance to Interrogation participants subjected to sleep deprivation?
 - i. If so on average how long were subjects deprived of sleep?
 - ii. Without out providing personal details of each subject please provide a list showing how many hours each interrogation subject over the last 16 years were deprived of sleep?
- k) Were the Resistance to Interrogation participants subjected to very loud noises for long periods of time throughout the exercise?

- l) Were the Resistance to Interrogation participants subjects deprived of food and water?
- m) Were the Resistance to Interrogation participants uniform/clothing taken from them?
 - i. Were they dressed in garb similar to hospital gowns?
 - ii. Were the interrogation subjects in the course of the Resistance to Interrogation exercises effectively near naked by the end of the exercise - after pieces were removed from the hospital gowns ?
- n) Was the temperature of the rooms where the Resistance to Interrogation exercises conducted kept deliberately low to maximise discomfort for the interrogation subject, if so what was the temperature of these rooms?
- o) Were the Resistance to Interrogation subjects coerced to sit, stand, kneel in stress positions designed to cause pain over time?
- p) Were these Resistance to Interrogation exercises documented, filmed or electronically recorded in any way?
 - i. If these activities were documented, filmed or electronically recorded, how many hours of these recordings are stored by the ADF?
 - ii. Have these recordings been used for current or past training purposes?
- q) In the last 16 years how many ADF personnel have reported either physical or mental injuries after participating in these Resistance to Interrogation exercises.
- r) Have any of the Resistance to Interrogation subjects past or present ever reported psychological symptoms like PTSD after completing these exercises?
- s) Given that the Resistance to Interrogation exercise is deliberately designed to adversely affect the mental health of the interrogation subjects, have the ADF make any effort to monitor the mental health of the participants of these exercises after they have been discharged from service?
- t) Have any of the Resistance to Interrogation subjects ever successfully committed suicide either while serving or post discharge?
 - i. If so please provide detail?
- u) Are interrogation subjects ever exposed to sexual violence as part of the Resistance to Interrogation exercises?
- v) Are Resistance to Interrogation subjects ever subjected to verbal abuse, including sexual denigration by women?
- w) Does the Resistance to Interrogation exercise comply with international conventions against torture?
 - i. Have the Resistance to Interrogation exercises ever been independently assessed to make sur they comply with the relevant guidelines?
 - ii. Could the ADF be in breach of the Geneva Convention against torture?
- x) Which agencies or departments including the ADF were actively involved in organising, observing and or participating in the Resistance to Interrogation exercise's, please list all of the relevant agencies and or departments?
- y) Lieutenant General Angus Campbell have you read a copy of my recent adjournment speech where under parliamentary privilege - I named many high ranking ADF officers?
 - i. Isn't it the case that you have worked with many of those people and are friends with many of these people
 - ii. Would it be fair to say that you would have to disqualify yourself from investigating these people – because of a clear conflict of interest?

Answer:

(a) No; however, resistance to interrogation training has been conducted in Defence for the past 16 years. Resistance to Interrogation training has transitioned to become Conduct After Capture training. The Defence Intelligence Organisation does not run Conduct After Capture training (Hansard page 31). The Defence Force School of Intelligence is responsible for the delivery of the training which is conducted to provide individuals, considered prone to capture, with the skills and knowledge of how to survive a capture situation and return home to Australia, post capture, with dignity. Special Air Service Regiment (SASR) soldiers have undertaken Conduct After Capture training in the past 16 years.

(b) Refer to Additional Budget Estimates 10 February 2016 Question on Notice 15.

(c) No.

(d) No. All participants in Conduct After Capture training are volunteers. All participants are provided an activity overview and instructed in how to conduct themselves in a capture situation prior to undertaking a practical activity. At the completion of this classroom-based training, participants sign a volunteer declaration form indicating their volunteer status for practical training. At the start of the practical training the Conducting Officer provides an opportunity for all participants to reaffirm their volunteer status or choose not to commence the activity. Participants also have the right to withdraw from the training at any time.

This training is a requirement of full qualification in the Special Air Service Regiment. Careers take other pathways if a person is not fully qualified for service in that particular unit.

(e) No. Conduct After Capture is not a pass or fail activity. Participants have a proficiency added to their online profile to indicate completion of the training. Nothing is recorded on profiles of individuals who do not complete the training.

(f) Yes. 30 females have undertaken Conduct After Capture training since 2007. Exact numbers of females who participated prior to 2007 are unknown as only paper records exist for the period prior, and Defence has not completed a review of archived documents prior to 2007. Appropriately qualified females have also been involved in various trainer and support staff roles.

(g) No. Conduct After Capture training is not deliberately designed to adversely affect the mental health of the activity participants.

Conduct After Capture training is designed for ADF personnel who are deemed at potential risk of capture or detention overseas. Trainees are taught how to combat the rigours of capture, captivity and exploitation across the spectrum of captivity from both a theoretical and practical perspective. The aim is to enable individuals to survive capture or detention with dignity.

(h) No. Defence has no evidence of this.

All trainees, whether they complete the activity or withdraw from training early, are individually debriefed by both a Conduct After Capture trainer and a psychology officer. During this process they have an opportunity to raise any concerns about the training, including the way in which they were treated, and discuss any psychological or medical concerns.

- (i)-(o) and (v) This information is sensitive and for official use only. If a threat force understood Australian Defence Force (ADF) conduct after capture techniques and procedures, it would enable them to alter their tactics, techniques and procedures in order to improve their chances of successfully exploiting detained or captured Defence personnel. This could potentially pose a risk to the lives of Australian Defence Force personnel captured or detained in the future.
- (p) Conduct After Capture training is documented and electronically recorded. There are thousands of hours of electronic recordings of Conduct After Capture training. The recordings are occasionally used in the training of new Resistance Trainers. They are not used during Conduct After Capture activities.
- (q) Army, through the use of end-of-course evaluation and debrief data, will determine how many ADF personnel reported physical and/or psychological issues at the conclusion of Conduct after Capture training. This will take some time and will be provided to the Committee once complete.
- (r) Mental health disorders such as Post Traumatic Stress Disorder are often caused by an aggregation of a range of events in a person's life. Disaggregating these to establish a specific causal link between a person's mental health disorder and Conduct After Capture training is unlikely to be possible.

Conduct After Capture is a voluntary activity and participants are closely monitored by Army psychologists through the conduct of the activity. The exercises are tightly controlled and any participant who is identified by a psychologist as struggling with the activity, is spoken to by the psychologist and if necessary, removed from the exercise. All participants (regardless of whether they have remained on or been removed from the exercise) receive a one-on-one psychological screen with a psychologist at the end of the exercise. This screen seeks to identify if any participant was affected or distressed by any elements of the exercise, and arrange follow-up referral to a mental health professional if necessary.

Aside from this screen, many members who have completed Conduct After Capture have also deployed overseas and have therefore received both the Return to Australia Psychological Screen and the Post Operation Psychological Screen. These are opportunities for members to discuss any mental health issues with a psychologist. Furthermore, all Army members have access to a wide range of mental health professionals (nurses, Medical Officers and psychologists), and for those who have deployed, access to the Veterans and Veterans' Families Counselling Service.

- (s) Conduct After Capture training is not deliberately designed to adversely affect the mental health of the activity participants.

Conduct After Capture training is designed for ADF personnel who are deemed at potential risk of capture or detention overseas. Trainees are taught how to combat the rigours of capture, captivity and exploitation across the spectrum of captivity from both a theoretical and practical perspective. The aim is to enable individuals to survive capture or detention with dignity.

Army has no means by which to track the mental health of Conduct After Capture participants following their discharge from the Army.

- (t) Suicide is usually a consequence of a wide range of distal and proximal factors. Establishing any specific causal link to participation in Conduct After Capture exercises is unlikely to be possible.

Conduct After Capture activities are voluntary and well-controlled. Participants are monitored closely and psychologically screened at the completion of the exercise. Members also have access to a wide range of mental health support services and if deployed on overseas operations, participate in psychological screens associated with those deployments.

- (u) No.

- (w) The ADF does not conduct activities that involve torture.

The ADF's Conduct After Capture training complies with Australia's international legal obligations including those that prohibit acts of torture.

The ADF's Conduct After Capture Training has been independently legally reviewed by a Senior Reserve Legal Officer.

Legal advice is subject to Legal Professional Privilege.

- (x) Conduct After Capture training is an Australian Defence Force activity involving Australian Defence Force personnel.

- (y)(i). Yes.

- (y)(ii). No.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Submarine Commanding Officers

Question reference number: 52

Senator: Xenophon

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) Noting the low number of successful submariners passing the Dutch Perisher course, what is the plan to increase the attendance and pass rate of Australian submariners endeavouring to become submarine commanding officers.
- (b) The Chief of Navy has classified SECRET details as to the Navy's submarine workforce. With reference to this recent Navy News article <http://news.navy.gov.au/en/Jan2016/People/2656#.Vqq9EFKDtQc> entitled "Silent service continues to build capability" which reveals the number of submarine warfare officers on the most recent course and the pass rate, please provide the boundaries to the Chief of Navy's statement at Estimates (perhaps by way of a security grading list).
- (c) At the Estimates hearing, the Chief of Defence Force stated that the issue of submarines became politicised and that too much information has been drawn out with respect to "primary capabilities". Assuming this statement refers to the pass rate of Australian submarine Commanding Officers:
 - (i) Can the Chief of Defence Force explain why, in the absence of political pressure, this information was freely published in a place (the honour board in the foyer of the Submarine System Training Centre) where there is access by uncleared people or people with no need to know?
 - (ii) What is the current state of the honour board?
 - (iii) Can the Chief of Defence Force provide guidance as to the balance between the security concerns of the Executive and the fact, in law, that the Executive's primary responsibility in its prosecution of government is owed to Parliament (i.e. in some sense, the "primary capabilities" are the capabilities that the Parliament should direct more of its scrutiny).
- (d) How will secrecy issues for personnel attending the Dutch perisher course be managed, noting the course is attended by foreign naval officers?

Answer:

- (a) Since 2014, Navy has been executing a Submarine Workforce Growth Strategy to achieve an expanded submarine workforce. This strategy, supported by ever-increasing submarine availability following Coles and Rizzo implementation, will help ensure Navy achieves its requirements for graduating officers on the Submarine Commanding Officers course.

In January 2016, Navy introduced a Submarine Deliberately Differentiated Package consisting of seven components—five non-financial and two financial—to attract, re-attract and retain submariners, including potential submarine commanding officers.

- (b) Detailed advice on submarine workforce strength and currency is classified because of the direct relationship with capability. The details of those officers who attend and pass the Submarine Commanding Officers Course, or other submarine related courses, is not indicative of workforce strength and are therefore unclassified.
- (c)
 - (i) The Honour Board acknowledges the successful Submarine Commanding Officer Course candidates over many decades and is unclassified. It does not detail overall strength or currency of submarine Commanding Officers.
 - (ii) The Honour Board remains in place at the Submarine Training and Systems Centre, HMAS *Stirling*, in recognition of those who have achieved this significant career milestone.
 - (iii) Detailed advice on submarine workforce strength and currency are classified because of the direct relationship with capability.
- (d) There are no secrecy issues pertaining to those officers attending the Submarine Command Course. Detailed advice on submarine workforce strength and currency remains classified and will not be made public.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Submarines – CEP – Data Item Description

Question reference number: 53

Senator: Xenophon

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

With respect to the submarine Competitive Evaluation Process and a new Data Item Description released under a Contract Amendment:

- (a) Please provide details of the sort of information that is being sought?
- (b) Please provide the legal/probity advice relied upon to issue the contract amendment? If not, please provide a comprehensive public interest immunity claim with respect this request, including the nature of any harm that might be caused in relation to tendering the advice.
- (c) Who was the approving authority for the Contract Amendment?
- (d) Was anyone more senior than the approving authority for the Contract Amendment consulted prior to it being issued, and, if so, who was consulted?

Answer:

- (a) A new Data Item Description (DID) was provided to each Competitive Evaluation Process (CEP) participant on 22 January 2016. The DID provides information to the participants regarding a number of key commercial principles and requirements in relation to which the Future Submarine Program seeks commitments from the participants. They include principles relating to commercial risk allocation, financial matters, transparency, and governance.

Consistent with the terms of the CEP agreed with the participants, the Australian Government is seeking to ensure that the extent and nature of the commitment that each participant is prepared to provide on these requirements is fully and clearly understood by the Commonwealth. The participants have been advised that, if selected as the international partner, these commitments will form an enduring set of agreed principles that will apply to contracts for all phases of the Future Submarine Program.

Due to the nature of the government to government arrangements under which Japan is participating in the CEP, Japan was provided with the same information in the form of an annex to those arrangements rather than a DID.

The responses of all participants will be assessed against the same evaluation criteria issued at the outset of the CEP.

- (b) As the Probity Adviser to the Future Submarine Program, the Australian Government Solicitor provided probity advice clearing the contract amendment. As the Legal Adviser to the Future Submarine Program, Clayton Utz provided legal advice clearing the contract amendment. Both items of advice are subject to legal privilege.
- (c) RADM Greg Sammut, Head Future Submarine Program, was the approving authority for issue of the Contract Amendment.
- (d) Mr Stephen Johnson, General Manager Submarines, was consulted prior to the issue of the Contract Amendment.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Submarines – Submarine Combat System

Question reference number: 54

Senator: Xenophon

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) Noting a decision appears to have been made that the future submarine will be fitted with an AN/BYG-1 Combat System, what is the projected cost of an AN/BYG-1 with respect to:
 - (i) Procurement in dollar value terms
 - (ii) Through life sustainment (including annual payments) in dollar value terms
- (b) Noting it is the intention to engage a Combat System Integrator to integrate sensor and weapon components into the Command and Control System:
 - (i) Will the sensor system be chosen by way of tender? If not, how will they be selected?
 - (ii) Will the integrator have any role in the selection of the sensor or will the system integrator's role be restricted to the provision of integration cost and risk information?
- (c) The answer to QON 65(5) of October 2015 Estimates, in so far as it acknowledges that Australian Industry are restricted in their ability to fully participate in Step 3 and 4 of the Advance Processor Build (APB) program, seems inconsistent with the answer provided at QON 202 of May 2012 Estimates. With respect to Step 3 and 4 of the APB process, how does Defence intend complete for inclusion in the full development cycle on the same basis as United States Industry?

Answer:

(a)(i) and (ii) While indicative procurement and sustainment costs for the Future Submarine version of AN/BYG-1 can be modelled to some extent from the equivalent costs for Collins, there will be differences and actual costs will be refined during the Future Submarine design process. For example, the Future Submarine will be designed from the outset for installation of AN/BYG-1. The ongoing evolution of AN/BYG-1 will also influence procurement and sustainment costs.

(b)(i) and (ii) The sensor selection process, including the role of the Combat System Integrator, is likely to vary depending on the sensor and particular capability decisions that will be made during the Future Submarine design process.

(c) Australian prototype developers compete on the same merit basis as United States prototype developers within the AN/BYG-1 Advanced Development Program, and can be involved in all steps of the process, including Step 3 (end-to-end system integration and test) and Step 4 (at-sea testing) where required. Should an Australian industry prototype advance to Step 3 or beyond, Defence will consider providing appropriate additional financial support, such as funding international travel.

A Technology Maturation Process to improve Australian industry competitiveness is being implemented. For further information on this process, refer to Question on Notice No. 20 from 21 October 2015 Supplementary Budget Estimates.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Macroeconomics Report

Question reference number: 55

Senator: Xenophon

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) On what date was the document “A preliminary analysis of the economic impact of the future submarine based on the experience of the Collins program” delivered to Defence?
- (b) Does this document reference a Cabinet Submission?
- (c) Does this Document summarise a Cabinet Submission?
- (d) Defence testified at Estimates that the model produced by Macroeconomics.com.au PTY LTD considers a number of factors with respect to spill over/second order effects. Please provide a list of the factors that it considers.

Answer:

- (a) 5 August 2014.
- (b) No, as stated at both the 10 February and 3 March 2016 Senate Estimate Hearings.
- (c) No, as stated at the 3 March 2016 Senate Estimate Hearings.
- (d) The model considers potential technology and labour skills spillover effects as well as value-added direct, production-induced and consumption-induced multiplier effects.

Senate Standing Committee Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Offshore Patrol Vessels

Question reference number: 56

Senator: Xenophon

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Why is it necessary for the Department to complete competitive evaluation process to select the build location of the Offshore Patrol Vessels, but that such a process is not necessary to select the build location for the Future Frigate?

Answer:

On 18 April 2016 Government announced:

- First pass approval for the Offshore Patrol Vessels (OPVs), with construction to begin in Adelaide in 2018 following the completion of the Air Warfare Destroyers and transfer of the remaining OPVs to Western Australia when the Future Frigate construction begins in Adelaide in 2020.
- First pass approval for the Future Frigates which will be built in Adelaide commencing 2020.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016
ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: F-35 JSF – Interactions with the United States

Question reference number: 57

Senator: Xenophon

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) What positions and teams have Australian personnel occupied in the JSF Program Office (JPO)?
- (b) What issues has Australia raised with the JSF Executive Steering Board (JESB)?
- (c) How many issues raised by Australia in the JSF Executive Steering Board have been overruled?
- (d) What contributions has Australia made to the JESB?
- (e) What contributions has Australia made to the design of the F-35?
- (f) With respect to the F-35, to what extent does Australia engage with areas of the US Department of Defense other than the JPO and JESB, such as the Office of Test and Evaluation or acquisition/costing organisations?
- (g) To what extent did the Australian civilian and military bodies engage with the US Congressional Budget Office (CBO) or Government Accountability Office (GAO) in assessing costs for the F-35?
- (h) To what extent has Australian civilian and military bodies considered the estimates of the GAO and CBO, which considered the US Department of Defense's cost estimates to be unrealistic and optimistic, in determining the likely costs and delivery schedule for Australia's F-35s?

Answer:

- (a) As a Partner on the program, Australia enjoys privileged access to the program through its embedded Cooperative Project Personnel. The specialisation and number of Australian staff embedded in the F-35 Joint Program Office has continued to evolve as the program matures from the System Development and Demonstration phase to the Production, Sustainment and Follow-on Development phases. Australia has specialist representation in areas of Air System Requirements, Development Test and Evaluation, Operational Test and Evaluation, Software Development, Airworthiness, Air Vehicle and Structures Engineering, Reprogramming, Production, Sustainment, Information Systems Development (including the F-35 Autonomic Logistics Information System), Aircrew and Maintainer Training, Prognostic Health Monitoring, Science and Technology Research, Finance Management, and Contracting. Furthermore, Australia has previously had specialist staff provide valuable contributions to F-

35 Electromagnetic Environmental Effects (E3) research, development, test, and evaluation.

With two RAAF F-35A aircraft operating in the International Pilot Training Center at Luke Air Force Base in Arizona, Australia also has qualified F-35 instructor pilots and an engineer embedded within the United States (US Air Force 56 Fighter Wing. As well as providing the initial pilot training throughput required for Australia, the opportunity provides a rich learning opportunity for Australia on the operation and sustainment of the F-35A ahead of aircraft arriving in Australia in December 2018.

The Australian team in the US is led by a National Deputy, who has direct daily exchange with the F-35 Program Executive Officer, LtGen Bogdan, on all elements of the F-35 program.

- (b) The JSF Executive Steering Board (JESB) provides executive-level guidance and oversight of the global F-35 program. As a Partner on the program, Australia has a voice and voting membership on the JESB.

Typically, Australia pushes the JESB to focus on key program risks that concern Australia. These have included, and in many cases continue to include, cost/budget performance and overall program affordability, program schedule performance, software development and test, development and test of the Autonomic Logistics Information System (ALIS), development and test of Mission Data Files (known as reprogramming), and development of the Global Support Solution.

- (c) Australia is a well respected contributor to JESB discussions, debate and decision making. Defence knows of no issues or risks that Australia has raised at JESB meetings which have been overruled or contested by the other JESB Members.
- (d) Along with the other Partners on the program, Australia consistently demands integrity, accountability and transparency on the program. In terms of specific contributions to the JESB and its subordinate governance bodies, Australia has played a significant role in shaping the Global Support Solution, driven by our expertise in sustainment, and the unique challenges Australia faces in terms of geography and long supply lines. Further, Australia has provided regular independent schedule risk assessments (with recommendations) on the development and test path of Mission Systems software and ALIS. Australia has also been successful in ensuring the F-35 Joint Program Office and Prime Contractors are acutely focused on cost/budget performance. With significant experience in performance based contracting, Australia has made a positive influence in shaping the future contracting framework for F-35 production, sustainment and follow-on development/modernisation. A final example of Australian contribution is the focus placed on sovereign data security within ALIS. Planning is underway to update the ALIS architecture to provide this important design requirement.
- (e) Through its specialist Cooperative Project Personnel that are embedded within the F-35 Joint Program Office, Australia has provided direct influence on the design and development of the F-35. Most notably this includes, among many examples, structural design and modification through durability testing and in-service engineering support, providing specialist input on software development,

improving the prognostic health monitoring system, driving positive change to ALIS architecture, assisting in development and test of electromagnetic environmental effects on the F-35, and providing Science and Technology support that has led to improved materials and processes, and improved aircraft reliability and availability.

Australian industry is also directly involved in the design and manufacture of aircraft components and assemblies, and support equipment. At the end of 2015, Australian industry had been awarded a total of US\$554.5 million in contracts.

- (f) Australia has regular and effective engagement with all key F-35 stakeholders within the US Department of Defence. Beyond the JPO and the JESB, this includes US Secretary of Defense, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, various agencies and principals from the US Air Force, US Navy and US Marine Corps, Director of Operational Test and Evaluation, Director of Development Test and Evaluation, and Director Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation. Australia is also one of only four nations that are signatories to the F-35 Initial Operational Test and Evaluation Memorandum of Understanding. Alongside the US, UK and the Netherlands, Australia has specialist staff embedded in the JSF Operational Test Team at Edwards Air Force Base, to contribute to the F-35 Operational Test and Evaluation and to gain daily insight that will assist Australia in the transition of air combat capability to the F-35A.
- (g) Defence is not aware of any direct engagement with the US Congressional Budget Office or Government Accountability Office (GAO); however the contents of the GAO report are considered by Defence to help inform engagement with the Joint Program Office. Defence uses the independent Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE) and the F-35 Joint Program Office to inform detailed cost planning and estimate activity for Australian F-35 Program.
- (h) Australia carefully considers all analysis by independent agencies in assessing F-35 costs. The reports produced by independent agencies have provided important sources of information for the Australian project office to develop its own independent analysis of costs and risk in the context of the Australian Program. Defence uses a range of sources, including the CAPE, the F-35 Joint Program Office, and the GAO Report, to ensure an independent view, relevant to the Australian context, is formed.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016
ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: F-35 JSF – Industrial Workforce Share

Question reference number: 58

Senator: Xenophon

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

What was the value of the industrial work share for the F-35 offered by Lockheed Martin in early 2002, and what parts or systems of the aircraft did this include? See <http://www.flightglobal.com/news/articles/australia-reconsiders-jsf-146151/>

Answer:

In 2002, Defence was negotiating Australia's participation in the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) Program; no formal industrial workshare was offered by Lockheed Martin at that time. However, Defence was confident that the contracts offered to Australian industry would be larger than the investment made by Australia to be a part of the JSF Program and commensurate with Australia's status as a Tier 3 Partner. The then Minister for Industry, Ian MacFarlane, said "Based on initial indications, we expect Australian firms to capture work in excess of our entry cost in the development phase alone. They will also be positioned well for substantial work in longer term production and support".

Industrial Participation opportunities and their potential values were formally captured for the first time in a Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of Defence and Lockheed Martin, at the time Australia signed the 'Production, Sustainment, and Follow-On Development' (PSFD) Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) in 2006. The MoU with Lockheed Martin reflected Lockheed Martin's intent to release Requests for Proposal/Quotation for a set of participation opportunities to Australian industry, subject to United States national disclosure policy and associated export license approval.

The combined value of opportunities at the time of signature was \$9.5 billion for JSF global supply chain work available over the forecast life of the Program. Conversion of opportunities to contracts was, and continues to be, predicated on Australian companies submitting Best Value offers, making any necessary investment in stand-up costs and consistently meeting cost, schedule and quality requirements. Consequently, Defence estimates the potential total contracted value of the opportunities currently being worked by Australian industry could reach \$2 billion by 2023.

At the end of 2015, Australian industry had been awarded a total of US\$554.5 million in contracts. In particular, contracts stemming from the development phase are in excess of US\$300 million.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: F-35 JSF - Modifications

Question reference number: 59

Senator: Xenophon

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) With respect to the following link
<http://www.flightglobal.com/news/articles/raaf-mulls-surveillance-modifications-for-jsf-154865/>
 - (a) Why did Australia explore the option of an additional removable fuel tank for the F-35 in September 2002?
 - (b) Did the RAAF consider the range of the JSF with standard internal fuel tanks sufficient for Australia's needs?
 - (c) Why was Australia looking for addition Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) capabilities for the F-35 in September 2002?
 - (d) Did Australia consider the standard ISR capabilities of the JSF adequate for Australia's needs?
- (b) What other additions or modifications for the F-35 did Australia explore in 2002?
- (c) Why were the additions/modifications not adopted?
- (d) What other additions or modifications for the F-35 did Australia explore, or request to the JSF programme office since 2002?

Answer:

- (a) In 2002, Defence was considering all AIR 6000 requirements including refueling capability options. In 2006, AIR 6000 requirements were determined and the F-35A was assessed as having sufficient range with air-to-air refueling capability to meet Australia's requirements.
- (b) During the period 2002 to 2006, Defence was exploring all AIR 6000 requirements to meet Australia's strategic defence requirements. In 2002 there was no specific focus on F-35 and what additions or modifications for the F-35 were needed.
- (c) Not applicable, given there was no specific focus in 2002 on F-35 and what additions or modifications for the F-35 were needed (refer response to (2) above).

- (d) Following First Pass Approval in November 2006 and becoming a Partner under the Production, Sustainment and Follow-on Development Memorandum of Understanding (PSFD MOU), Australia commissioned a study to examine the integration onto the F-35A of the Advanced Short Range Air to Air Missile (ASRAAM) Within Visual Range Missile as it was the current in-service weapon employed by the F/A-18A/B. In addition, Australia cooperated with Canada to examine the feasibility of adding an air-to-air refuelling probe to the F-35A that would facilitate probe drogue refuelling in addition to the existing boom receptacle capability. Analysis in both cases supported not pursuing either modification.

In addition, Australia is seeking a Common Partner approach to production line modifications that enable the cost effective routing of additional fibre-optic cables to support future mission system modernisation efforts. A study has also been commissioned to examine the implementation of a satellite communication capability compatible with the Australian Defence Force Satellite Communications standards. Lastly, Australia has contributed to industry studies that have examined feasibility and risk associated with the integration of the Norwegian Joint Strike Missile, a maritime strike weapon, onto the F-35A.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: F-35 JSF – General Project Questions

Question reference number: 60

Senator: Xenophon

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) When did Australia first begin looking at the F-35 as a possible acquisition option for Australia?
- (b) When did the RAAF first decide the F-35 was the right aircraft for Australia?
- (c) What was discussed between Prime Minister John Howard and Lockheed Martin in Washington in 2002?
- (d) Why did Australia cancel the competition for a new strike fighter in June 2002 despite advice from within the Department that the program was risky and there was insufficient information available to make a prudent decision – see <http://www.smh.com.au/federal-politics/political-news/raaf-ignored-joint-strike-fighter-advice-20130312-2fyf7.html>
- (e) What has been Australia's involvement in Norway's development of the Joint Strike Missile, and why was Australia involved?
- (f) How does Australia define a fifth generation aircraft, and what characteristics or capabilities does Australia consider to be fifth-generation?
- (g) Does the Department or the RAAF consider the F-35 to be capable of supercruise?

Answer:

- (a) Project AIR 6000 was established in 1999 to acquire a new air combat capability to replace the capability provided then by the Royal Australian Air Force's (RAAF) F/A-18A/B and F-111C/G aircraft. Defence sought formal requests for information on a list of prospective candidates, including the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter (JSF).
- (b) The Australian Government decided in June 2002 to become a partner in the F-35A System Development and Demonstration Program. Defence undertook to monitor other prospective candidates should the F-35 Program not develop as expected.
- (c) Defence does not know what was discussed at this meeting.

- (d) As noted in the response to (b), Australia did not discard alternative capabilities to the F-35 in 2002. Rather, the Australian Government identified the F-35 as the preferred capability to satisfy the Government's expectations of the air combat force, following a comprehensive analysis conducted over many years. This analysis identified where alternative platforms would be unable to meet all of Australia's requirements and highlighted the vulnerabilities of some of these platforms to advanced threats that F-35 capabilities overcome. In addition, the available alternatives were shown to have limitations in the ability to be modernised over their service life to defeat more complex threats beyond 2030. Notwithstanding, Defence continued to monitor the alternative capabilities to the F-35 in case the F-35 development path did not progress as expected.

The alternative aircraft that were analysed and their capability paths monitored included the Super Hornet, Eurofighter, Rafale and Gripen.

- (e) The Australian Government and the Government of the Kingdom of Norway have been engaged since 1990 through a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on Cooperation and Defence Equipment Research, Development, Production and Procurement. This MoU commits the Parties to '*cooperate in the initiation of joint programs utilising the industry resources of each country to research, develop and produce defence equipment to meet the requirements of each or both of the defence forces of the Parties*'. Under this MoU, Norway and Australia have been cooperating for over a decade to reduce the risk associated with integrating an advanced maritime strike capability on the F-35A. This activity sought to ensure that at least one advanced maritime strike option was available on the F-35A for consideration under Project AIR 3023 *Enhanced Maritime Strike for the Air Combat Capability*.

Project AIR 3023 *Enhanced Maritime Strike for the Air Combat Capability* is scoped to deliver an enhanced maritime strike capability for the Australian Defence Force, primarily through the delivery of an advanced maritime strike weapon for the F-35A. At present, the Norwegian Joint Strike Missile (JSM) is the most mature advanced maritime strike weapon in development for the F-35A, but will be subject to further Government consideration.

Although early in the project's life, Defence has an opportunity to cooperate with the Norwegian Ministry of Defence on the development of the JSM ahead of planned First Pass consideration in May 2016. This cooperation will better inform Government consideration of the project and, if selected at Second Pass in 2020, will deliver positive cost and capability outcomes.

Further, the cooperative development activities will benefit Australian industry through BAE Systems Australia development of proposed enhancements to weapon capabilities and QinetiQ through integration of the enhanced capability into the F-35A mission planning system.

Norway is planning to introduce the JSM into service in 2021.

- (f) The F-35 design itself is a product of war fighter requirements which considered the relative importance of specific fighter characteristics in the execution of the intended missions. The importance of stealth, payload, range and combat manoeuvrability, obtained through weapons, fuel and sensors being carried internally, outweighed other potential design choices.

Networked with advanced datalinks and sensors, a combat configured F-35 has the manoeuvrability, stealth and superior situational awareness to enable the engagement of air and surface targets while delaying and defeating an adversary's attack.

The characteristics of lethality, survivability, affordability and supportability define the F-35 as a fifth-generation fighter and were critical factors in the selection of the F-35. Defence understands the design parameters for the F-35A and the combined effect of its fighter characteristics in the battlespace, and is confident that this variant of the F-35 design will meet Australia's war fighting needs.

- (g) Supercruise for combat aircraft is generally accepted as sustained supersonic flight in a combat configuration without the use of afterburner, although the associated envelope defined by altitude and Mach, and the duration and range achievable vary considerably with aircraft type. Supercruise in this sense was not a design goal for the F-35. This does not preclude the F-35A from travelling tactically significant distances at high Mach number relatively efficiently.

Senate Standing Committee Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Competitive Evaluation Process – Defence Workforce

Question reference number: 61

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question: At Defence Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016, the following exchange occurred:

Senator XENOPHON: The question asked: In regard to the answer given by the Minister for Defence to a question without notice on 23 November 2015, (Senate Hansard, p.45), and noting the importance placed on competition in the Commonwealth Procurement Rules (CPRs)—see section 5 of the CPRs—what advice has been provided to the Minister that grounds the statement that down-selecting to two partners would 'add another three or four years to the delivery of the future submarine'. So I am just trying to understand why having a competitive process and having two contenders—being down-selected to two contenders—would add three of four years to the future submarine process.

Mr Richardson: Sure.

Rear Adm. Sammut: We had a discussion at the last Senate estimates about the work that would be involved once we select an international partner to actually arrive at an understanding of the sort of submarine we will end up with, the time it will take to build it, the cost range that would be involved, the construction methods, the sustainment methods and, in fact, all of the factors that would lead into an understanding of the actual cost of the future submarine. That would support a decision then to proceed with its more detailed design and construction. That is a process of concept design and preliminary design and, as I recall explaining at the last Senate estimates also, that is a very resource-intensive process. We will require to be engaged with the selected international partner to be involved in the various cost-capability trade-offs that will be necessary to help us retire risk and get to that understanding of the actual submarine that will be built, bearing in mind that the future submarine is a new design. Even though it may have its lineage in an existing design of some form, the amount of work that is going to be done will be equivalent to a new design process. That is, as I said, resource-intensive work, and we would end up being severely diluted if we had to do that with two international partners—or two participants, I should say—before the downselect was done to the international partner that would eventually design and build the future submarine for Australia. At the same time there would have to be a number of concurrent things happening. That

includes the transfer of design knowledge into Australia that goes with the design process, and also preparation for the construction of the submarine using methods that are germane to the particular international partner. That is work that can be happening concurrently with the international partner if they are selected early enough, with enough information to make that selection. Our contention is that the CEP is providing us with a lot of information upon which we can judge the most suitable international partner, or inform government with the information that would help them decide on who the most suitable international partner would be to work with us to do that. So what I am saying there is that the time involved in working with the potential international partner to develop an understanding of those processes is lengthy. If we had to do it with two of them then, for the reasons I have just mentioned, we would conceivably add three to four years to the time it would take to get to the point where we would have all the information we need to make a decision on the submarine that we would build.

- (a) What is the current size of the Defence workforce that is engaged with international partners as part of the Competitive Evaluation Process on the process of concept design and preliminary design to which Rear Admiral Sammut referred?
- (b) When Defence calculated that a down-selection to two rather than one bidder “would conceivably add three to four years”, did Defence make any allowance for additional staff and resource supplementation? If so, please indicate in both percentage and real terms the size of the additional supplementation to staffing and resourcing that was assumed as part of Defence’s calculations.

Answer:

- (a) The process of concept and preliminary design will be undertaken with DCNS as the selected international partner to work with Australia to design the Future Submarine. Concept and preliminary design was not conducted during the Competitive Evaluation Process.
- (b) Yes. During the concept and preliminary design phase, the workforce of the Future Submarine Program Office will grow by an additional 90 members of staff, which represents an increase of 75 per cent.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Submarines – Future submarines Project

Question reference number: 62

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

On 25 January 2016, *The Australian* published an article by Greg Sheridan entitled ‘Cautious US gives Japan edge in Subs’.

- (a) Mr Sheridan’s article states that: “*Australian officials at the most senior level believe Canberra could experience significant difficulty getting the most advanced US combat systems for between eight and 12 new submarines unless Japan wins the lead role in the project*”. The article also states that: “... *there are likely to be differences about what technology they would finally offer to one choice as opposed to another.*” Without reference to any particular bid or bidder, can Defence confirm whether the United States – or any US agency, entity, or supplier – has indicated that more or less advanced combat systems or technology would be made available depending on which of the three bids is chosen?
- (b) Mr Sheridan’s article said that: “... *the Americans harbour significant doubts about the German ability to protect critical defence technology from Chinese industrial espionage.*”
 - (i) Without reference to any particular bid or bidder, has the United States raised concerns or questions with Australia about the potential for espionage with respect to any of the Future Submarine bidders?
 - (ii) Has any analysis been done by Australia, either unilaterally or in conjunction with the United States, about the potential exposure of the three bidders to espionage?
- (c) Citing unnamed sources and insiders, Mr Sheridan’s article reports that the costs being quoted in public for the Future Submarine are “meaningless at this stage”. Mr Sheridan also reports that the costs of the project are starting to scare the public and as a result “... *the cost of maintaining the subs throughout their life, which is where the majority of the costs come in, are now routinely left off the public cost estimates for the project*”.

- (i) What is Defence's current cost estimate or envelope for the Future Submarine Project?
- (ii) In broad terms, how much of this is attributable to the design and build phases?
- (iii) In broad terms, how much of this is attributable to operation and through life sustainment?

Answer:

- (a) No.
- (b)
 - (i) No specific issue of espionage has been raised.
 - (ii) Both Australia and its International partner will be exposed to a threat of espionage. This will necessitate the implementation of appropriate security measures to protect sensitive and classified information.
- (c)
 - (i)(ii)(iii) The approximate investment value in the design and construction of the Future Submarines, as outlined in the 2016 Defence Integrated Investment Plan, is >\$50bn (adjusted for inflation over the coming decades). The cost range for operation and sustainment of the Future Submarine fleet will be developed through the normal course of logistical support analysis and cost-capability trades during the submarine design process.

Senate Standing Committee Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Submarines – Competitive Evaluation Process

Question reference number: 63

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

With respect to the Competitive Evaluation Process for the Future Submarines:

- (a) When were each of the final bids received from the three bidders?
- (b) How many clarifying questions have been asked of the bidders following receipt of the final bids? Please provide a breakdown of the number of questions asked per bidding consortia.
- (c) When does Defence expect to conclude its analysis of the final bids?
- (d) At Supplementary Budget Estimates on 21 October 2015, Secretary Richardson said: “... *there will be a decision by government in the first half of next year.*”
 - (i) Is it still the case that a decision will be made by Government during the first half of the year – i.e. on or before 30 June 2016?
 - (ii) Has Defence provided advice to Government recommending a preferred bidder?
 - (iii) If yes, on what date was that advice provided to Government?
 - (iv) If no, when does Defence expect it will provide advice to Government recommending a preferred bidder?

Answer:

- (a) Proposals from DCNS of France, TKMS of Germany and the Government of Japan were received on 30 November 2015.
- (b) Refer to response provided to Question on Notice 14 from the Additional Estimates hearing of 10 February 2016.
- (c) and (d) After comprehensive consideration of the Competitive Evaluation Process proposals, advice will be provided to the Government in 2016. A decision on which international partner will be selected to work with Australia to develop and deliver the Future Submarine will be made in 2016.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Submarines - White Paper

Question reference number: 64

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question: Defence Minister Payne has said publicly that the Defence White Paper will be announced in the first quarter of 2016. With respect to the Future Submarine Project:

- (a) Will the Defence White Paper indicate the number of submarines that will be purchased?
- (b) Will the Defence White Paper indicate whether an overseas, local or hybrid build will be adopted?
- (c) How will the Defence White Paper account for the cost of the Future Submarines Project if a successful bid has not be selected at the time of the Defence White Paper's release

Answer:

- (a) Yes, see Defence White Paper.
- (b) No, see Defence White Paper.
- (c) The Defence White Paper includes a funding provision to acquire a fleet of 12 new submarines, informed by independent cost assurance work undertaken in support of the development of the Defence White Paper.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Iraq and Syria – Request for Additional Positions

Question reference number: 65

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- a) During Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016, the following exchange occurred:

Senator CONROY: *You have already mentioned this. The 10 additional positions in the coalition headquarters were not in response to the letter. Was that something that we were already doing?*

Air Chief Marshal Binskin: *In the letter back the minister indicated that we would do that, but it was actually a separate request that came through a different channel. It all came together at the same time so, rather than consider two aspects, they were brought together.*

With respect to the ‘separate request’ that Australia received and resulted in the 10 additional positions:

- i. On what date was this request made and who made it?
 - ii. Was anything else requested beyond 10 additional headquarters staff? If so, in broad terms if necessary, what was requested?
- b) Former Defence Minister Kevin Andrews said in an interview with ABC on 14 January 2016 that:

“...we are training Iraqi forces, which is useful but the reality is unless there are forces on the ground, then we're not going to defeat ISIL.”

He also said that:

“... it's quite clear from the advice I received and that I was aware of, what the American military personnel and defence leaders were suggesting, and that was for months they were suggesting that we need forces on the ground in order to defeat ISIL.”

- i. Did Defence provide any advice to Mr Andrews that US officials were suggesting international forces were needed on the ground in Iraq to defeat

ISIL? If so, when was that advice provided, who provided it and in what form (written or verbal)?

- ii. Did Defence provide Mr Andrews with any advice about the potential deployment of Australian forces in a 'combat' or 'accompanying' role? If so, when was that advice provided, who provided it and in what form (written or verbal)?

Answer:

(a)(i)

- In November 2015, United States (US) Central Command requested that Australia fill the roles of Deputy Commander of the Combined Joint Forces Land Component Command - Operation Inherent Resolve and Deputy Commander of the Special Operations Joint Task Force - Operation Inherent Resolve.
- This request was limited to additional headquarters staff.
- The Minister for Defence formally notified her US counterpart that Australia would support these additional commitments in December 2015. Both positions are supported by a small staff of Australian Defence Force personnel.

(a)(ii)

- No

(b)(i) and (ii)

- The Department has provided frequent advice to Government about the coalition's military strategy to counter Daesh in Iraq, including the role of international forces, since 2014.
- Neither the US or Iraq have asked Australia for Australian personnel to conduct combat operations on the ground in Iraq.
- Australia's strategy is to train, advise and assist Iraq's Security Forces to conduct offensive operations against Daesh, so Iraq can ultimately assume full responsibility for its own security.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Force Posture Initiatives

Question reference number: 66

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

a) At Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016, the following exchange occurred:

Senator CONROY: *Someone mentioned during last estimates the "implementing arrangements". What are they? That is not the same as the cost-sharing agreement?*

Mr Baxter: *The implementing arrangements give effect to the treaty-level agreement, which we negotiated for the force posture initiatives, which came into force last year. So, hanging underneath that legally-binding document is a lot of the detail of how the initiative would work. Cost-sharing is one of the areas where we will have an implementing arrangement sitting under the treaty. So the treaty provided for a formula that the secretary described, which is proportional use/proportional pay. So if it is a joint facility that both Australia and the United States use we will work out the proportions by which we use it, and that will determine the cost. If it is just for Australia we will pay for it; if it is just for the United States, the United States will pay for it.*

Senator CONROY: *So, is there just one implementing arrangement or is there more than one?*

Mr Baxter: *There is more than one.*

Senator CONROY: *Have any been negotiated yet?*

Mr Baxter: *Yes, they have. We have an implementing arrangement, for instance, on consultation.*

- i. Please provide a list of how many Implementing Arrangements have been negotiated. For each of these Implementing Arrangements, please detail what subject(s)/issue(s) it concerns, when negotiations commenced and when negotiations concluded.
- ii. Please provide a list of how many Implementing Arrangements are currently under negotiation. For each of these Implementing Arrangements, please detail what

subject(s)/issue(s) it concerns, and a general assessment of the status of the negotiations.

- iii. Please provide a list of all Implementing Arrangements that are planned and/or expected to be negotiated. For each of these Implementing Arrangements, please detail what subject(s)/issue(s) it will relate to and when Defence expects to commence negotiations.

b) At Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016, Secretary Richardson said:

We are still negotiating the cost-sharing arrangements with the US. At the moment, most of them have been accommodated in Robertson Barracks and they have used some of our infrastructure accommodated there. Also, some of their aircraft are at RAAF Base Darwin. There will be, over time, the need for additional infrastructure, but the cost-sharing arrangements have not yet been negotiated.

With respect to the cost-sharing arrangement under negotiation with the United States:

- i. Please advise when formal negotiations began.
- ii. Please advise how many rounds of negotiations have occurred, including on what dates and in which locations.
- iii. For any planned or expected negotiation rounds, please advise when and where they are expected to occur and who is expected to participate.
- iv. For every negotiating round, please provide a list of all Australian and US officials involved in the negotiation. Please include their position details and indicate their role in the negotiations.
- v. Please provide a summary of the total funds spent by Defence on the negotiating rounds, including but not limited to flights, accommodation, meals, travel allowance, catering, and ground transportation. Please provide both a total figure, and a breakdown per negotiating round.

c) At Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016, the following exchange occurred:

Senator CONROY: *No, that is fair. But that sounds like a lot more money than for a few new barracks for the Marines, so what are the big-ticket items in the \$1 billion to \$2 billion?*

Mr Richardson: *Your big-ticket items will be in the air enhancement because you are potentially looking at airfield extensions, widening, apron work and the like. Again this is an area well beyond my competence. I always thought that when you extended a runway all you did was dig up a bit of dirt, pour in cement and away you go, but I am told that it is a little bit more complicated than that.*

- i. What if any planning has been done on the infrastructure requirements to support the full implementation of the US Force Posture Initiatives?
- ii. Which area(s) of Defence are responsible for infrastructure to support the US Force Posture Initiatives? Please identify which area has lead responsibility.
- iii. How advanced are discussions with the United States on plans for infrastructure to support the full implementation of the Force Posture Initiatives?

- iv. What meetings, working groups and/or negotiations have occurred between Australian and US officials with respect to infrastructure to support the full implementation of the US Force Posture Initiatives?
 1. Please provide a list of all such meetings, working groups and/or negotiations, including the dates, locations and attendees. Please also include position details and roles of attendees.
 2. Please provide a summary of the total funds spent by Defence on meetings, working groups and/or negotiations between Australian and US officials with respect to infrastructure to support the full implementation of the US Force Posture Initiatives, including but not limited to flights, accommodation, meals, travel allowance, catering, and ground transportation.
 - v. Based on planning to date, please provide a summary of what infrastructure works Defence expects will be required to support implementation, including at which Defence facilities the works will need to occur.
- d) At Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016, the following exchange occurred:
- Senator CONROY:** *What time are we talking about for those big-ticket pieces of infrastructure—a month, six months or a year? You probably know better than anyone.*
- Mr Richardson:** *In terms of construction time, you would not do it altogether; you would do it on a schedule. I believe you would measure it over a period of years rather than months.*
- i. Based on current planning assumptions, what period of time does Defence expect will be required to complete requisite infrastructure to support full implementation of the US Force Posture Initiatives?
 - ii. Based on current planning assumptions, when does Defence expect to be in a position to commence construction of this infrastructure?
 - iii. Based on current planning assumptions, when does Defence estimate that key pieces of infrastructure will be completed to support implementation of the US Force Posture Initiatives?

Answer:

(a)(i) Australia and the United States have finalised negotiations on two Implementing Arrangements:

- The Memorandum of Understanding between the Australian Department of Defence and the United States Department of Defense concerning the Designation of Agreed Facilities and Areas pursuant to the Force Posture Agreement between the Government of Australia and the Government of the United States of America. The Memorandum of Understanding outlines the areas and facilities within Australian Defence sites where the United States forces have rights and access of use, and specifies the types of activities for which agreed areas and facilities have been designated. Negotiations for the

Memorandum of Understanding commenced the week of 9 March 2015, following exchanges of draft versions at the working level between Australia and the United States. The Memorandum of Understanding was signed by Australia on 15 June 2015 and by the United States on 2 August 2015.

- The Implementing Arrangement for Consultation Pursuant to the Force Posture Agreement between Australia and the United States. The Implementing Arrangement for Consultation Pursuant to the Force Posture Agreement between Australia and the United States outlines the consultation process between Australia and the United States regarding the implementation of the Force Posture Agreement. Negotiations for the Implementing Arrangement for Consultation Pursuant to the Force Posture Agreement between Australia and the United States commenced at the Australia-United States Ministerial Consultations on 12 August 2014. The Implementing Arrangement for Consultation Pursuant to the Force Posture Agreement between Australia and the United States was signed by Australia on 15 June 2015 and by the United States on 2 August 2015.

(a)(ii) Australia and the US have commenced negotiations on one Implementing Arrangement:

- The Cost Sharing Implementing Arrangement to the Force Posture Agreement Between the Government of Australia and the Government of the United States of America. This Implementing Arrangement is expected to outline the cost sharing arrangements for infrastructure, operations and maintenance costs associated with the full implementation of the Force Posture Initiatives. Negotiations commenced over the period 2-3 December 2015.

(a)(iii) At this stage, Australia anticipates there will be a requirement to negotiate three further Implementing Arrangements:

- The Implementing Arrangement to the Force Posture Agreement between Australia and the United States concerning Enhanced Air Cooperation.
- The Implementing Arrangement to the Force Posture Agreement between Australia and the United States concerning the United States Marine Corps Initiative.
- The Administrative Implementing Arrangement. It is expected that the Administrative Implementing Arrangement will establish agreed processes for the provision of enabling services to United States Forces in Australia. Negotiations are expected to commence once the Cost Sharing Implementing Arrangement to the Force Posture Agreement Between the Government of Australia and the Government of the United States of America, Implementing Arrangement to the Force Posture Agreement between Australia and the United States concerning Enhanced Air Cooperation, and the Implementing Arrangement to the Force Posture Agreement between Australia and the United States concerning the United States Marine Corps Initiative have been agreed.

The Implementing Arrangement to the Force Posture Agreement between Australia and the United States concerning Enhanced Air Cooperation and the United States Marine Corps Initiative will capture a common, agreed language for the strategic end-state of the respective initiatives, phases of implementation, scope of activities and locations in which the initiatives will operate. While formal negotiations for the Implementing Arrangement to the Force Posture Agreement between Australia and the United States concerning Enhanced Air Cooperation and the Implementing Arrangement to the Force Posture Agreement between Australia and the United States concerning the United States Marine Corps Initiative have not commenced, Australia and the United States have commenced exchanging draft versions of both implementing arrangements at the working level. Working level discussions have also commenced for the Administrative Implementing Arrangement.

(b)(i) The first round of formal cost sharing negotiations, involving Australian and United States officials, occurred in Canberra over the period 2-3 December 2015.

(b)(ii) To date four rounds of formal cost sharing negotiations involving Australian and United States officials have occurred.

- Round 1: 2-3 December 2015, Canberra ACT, Australia
- Round 2: 10-11 March 2016, Washington DC, US
- Round 3: 29-30 June 2016, Honolulu, US
- Round 4: 2 September 2016, Washington DC, US

(b)(iii) There are no further formal cost sharing negotiation rounds planned or expected to occur at this time.

(b)(iv) Refer to the tables below.

Round 1			
2-3 December 2015			
Canberra ACT, Australia			
<i>Country</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>Role</i>
Australia	Mr Scott Dewar	First Assistant Secretary International Policy	Lead
Australia	Mr Adam Culley	Chief Finance Officer, Capability Acquisition and Sustainment Group	Finance
Australia	Mr Angus Kirkwood	Assistant Secretary Major Powers, International Policy Division	Policy

Australia	Air Commodore Anker Brodersen	Programme Manager, US Force Posture Initiatives Programme Office	Implementation
Australia	Ms Belinda McNamara	Director US Alliance Policy, International Policy Division	Policy
Australia	Ms Melissa Jones	Defence Legal	Legal
Australia	Miss Lana Roberts	Deputy Programme Manager, US Force Posture Initiatives Programme Office	Implementation
Australia	Mr Ben Olesen	US Force Posture Initiatives Programme Office	Infrastructure
Australia	Mr Alistair McEachern	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade	DFAT representative
Australia	Mr Farooq Mohammad	International Policy Division	Note taker
Australia	Mr Joe Keary	International Policy Division	Note taker

Round 2			
10-11 March 2016			
Washington DC, US			
<i>Country</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>Role</i>
Australia	Mr Scott Dewar	First Assistant Secretary International Policy	Lead
Australia	Mr Adam Culley	Chief Finance Officer, Capability Acquisition and Sustainment Group	Finance
Australia	Mr Michael Carey	Special Counsel, Defence Legal	Legal

Australia	Brigadier Tim Bayliss	Programme Manager, US Force Posture Initiatives Programme Office	Implementation
Australia	Ms Belinda McNamara	Director US Alliance Policy, International Policy Division	Policy
Australia	Mr Ben Olesen	US Force Posture Initiatives Programme Office	Infrastructure

Round 3 29-30 June 2016 Honolulu, US			
<i>Country</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>Role</i>
Australia	Mr Scott Dewar	First Assistant Secretary International Policy	Lead
Australia	Mr David Spouse	First Assistant Secretary Financial Services	Finance
Australia	RADM Stephen Gilmore	Head of Australian Defence Staff Washington	Diplomatic representative
Australia	Dr Sheridan Kearnan	Minister-Counsellor Defence Policy, Australian Embassy Washington	Diplomatic representative
Australia	Mr Andrew Evers	Legal Officer	Legal
Australia	Brigadier Tim Bayliss	Programme Manager, US Force Posture Initiatives Programme Office	Implementation
Australia	Mr Lachlan McGovern	Acting Director US Alliance Policy, International Policy Division	Policy
Australia	Ms Natasha Moore	US Force Posture Initiatives Programme Office	Enabling Support

Round 4			
2 September 2016			
Washington DC, US			
<i>Country</i>	<i>Name</i>	<i>Position</i>	<i>Role</i>
Australia	Mr Scott Dewar	First Assistant Secretary International Policy	Lead
Australia	Mr Adam Culley	Chief Finance Officer, Capability Acquisition and Sustainment Group	Finance
Australia	RADM Stephen Gilmore	Head of Australian Defence Staff Washington	Diplomatic representative
Australia	Dr Sheridan Kearnan	Minister-Counsellor Defence Policy, Australian Embassy Washington	Diplomatic representative
Australia	Mr Andrew Evers	Legal Officer	Legal
Australia	Brigadier Tim Bayliss	Programme Manager, US Force Posture Initiatives Programme Office	Implementation
Australia	Mr Lachlan McGovern	A/Director US Alliance Policy, International Policy Division	Policy
Australia	Ms Natasha Moore	US Force Posture Initiatives Programme Office	Enabling Support
Australia	Ms Mikaela James	Defence Senior Research Officer, Australian Embassy Washington	Note taker

Questions relating to information regarding United States officials should be directed to the United States Department of Defense.

(b)(v)The first round of formal cost sharing negotiations occurred in Canberra from 2 to 3 December 2015 incurred no cost to Defence.

The second round of formal cost sharing negotiations occurred in Washington DC from 10 to 11 March 2016. Costs included flights, accommodation, meals, travel

allowance and ground transportation costs for six Australian Department of Defence officials and senior staff. Approximately \$72,212.34 was expended.

The third round of formal cost sharing negotiations occurred in Honolulu, USA from 29 to 30 June 2016. Costs included flights, accommodation, meals, travel allowance and ground transportation costs for eight Australian Department of Defence officials and senior staff. Approximately \$53,310 was expended.

The fourth round of formal cost sharing negotiations occurred in Washington DC, USA on 2 September 2016. Costs included flights, accommodation, meals, travel allowance and ground transportation costs for five Australian Department of Defence officials and senior staff from Canberra. Approximately \$54,262 was expended.

(c)(i) Both Australia and the United States have undertaken extensive unilateral and combined planning on the infrastructure requirements for the implementation of the United States Force Posture Initiatives. Planning has focused on gaining a detailed understanding of infrastructure requirements, developing and costing options, and determining a package of works to support the two initiatives.

(c)(ii) The United States Force Posture Initiatives Programme Office in Defence is the 'Sponsor' for the implementation of the United States Force Posture Initiatives and currently has the lead responsibility in respect to the infrastructure requirements. The United States Force Posture Initiatives Programme Office works closely with Defence's Infrastructure Division in respect to the planning and delivery of the infrastructure works.

(c)(iii) Discussions are well advanced and are likely to continue for the duration of the infrastructure rollout phase.

(c)(iv)(1) This question is answered in the attached table. The table reflects records of the Department of Defence that were readily accessible in the time available to respond to this request. Any further interrogation of Defence records would represent an unreasonable diversion of departmental resources.

(c)(iv)(2) Approximately \$159,000 has been expended. This figure reflects records of the Department that were readily accessible in the time available to respond to this request. Any further interrogation of Defence records would represent an unreasonable diversion of departmental resources.

(c)(v) Defence expects works will be required at RAAF Base Darwin, RAAF Base Tindal, Robertson Barracks and a number of training areas and ranges.

Across these bases, training areas and ranges, works are likely to include airfield upgrades (including runways and aircraft parking aprons), living-in and working accommodation, support and wellness facilities (such as new messing facilities and gymnasium), logistics support facilities, medical facilities and associated enabling infrastructure (such as new roads, road upgrades and base access points).

Exact infrastructure and facilities requirements are subject to negotiations with the United States.

(d)(i) Based on current planning assumptions, seven years as per the published Defence Integrated Investment Plan (February 2016). Some infrastructure works, based on current planning, are anticipated to be completed sooner.

(d)(ii) and (d)(iii) The United States Force Posture Initiatives are already being implemented, with rotations of United States Marines through Darwin since 2012. United States Marine Corps and Enhanced Air Cooperation activities utilise existing infrastructure and training areas and ranges. While cost sharing negotiations are ongoing, Defence is working closely with United States counterparts to plan the infrastructure rollout. We anticipate construction for the first piece of infrastructure to commence in 2018. We expect the remaining infrastructure and facilities will be constructed between 2018 and 2026, recognising the exact timelines are contingent upon Australian and United States Government approvals and funding.

Meeting	Date	Location	Attendees	Position Details	Role
Joint Accommodation Planning Workshop	12-14 September 2012	HMAS Harman	Mark Power Bill Ross Adrian Power GPCAPT Scott Winchester Ron Hunter LTCOL Matthew Richardson MAJ Matthew Quinn Graham Lacey Tony Farrell Liam Hale WGCDR Rohan Gaskill Rachel Rees-Scott Sarah-Jayne McBride Garbis Avakian CAPT (RAN) Chris Roberts MAJGEN Mike Krause John Owens Mark Jenkin BRIG Patrick Kidd AIRCDRE Andrew Dowse	Contractor, Power Initiatives Contractor, RPL Contracting Contractor, Power Initiatives Infrastructure Development Agency Air Force Defence Support Organisation Regional Director – NT, SA, WA Staff Officer 1 Infrastructure, Army Headquarters Staff Officer 2 Infrastructure, Army Headquarters Director USFPI Director Base Planning, Infrastructure Division Project Director -NT, Infrastructure Division Infrastructure Development Agency Air Force Manager Estate & Facilities Services - NT Base Services Manager -Robertson Barracks Assistant Director USFPI, Joint Capability Coordination Director Strategic Logistics, Joint Logistics Command Head USFPI Head Infrastructure Head Defence Support Organsiation, Director General Plans -Army Director General Strategic Planning –Air Force	Facilitator Report writer Secretariat

			Frank Roberts Simone Murray	Head Australian Defence Force Posture Review Acting Assistant Secretary Estate Planning, Infrastructure Division	
--	--	--	--------------------------------	--	--

US Force Posture Review Facilities Workshop 2	29 April – 2 May 2013	HMAS Harman, Canberra	BRIG Graeme Finney LTCOL Glen Braithwaite LTCOL Matthew Quinn LTCOL Darryl Bridgeman LTCOL Peter Horrocks WGCDR Richard Alberts Tim Riley AIRCDRE Paul Cronan Michael Carey WGCDR Alec Tattersall Emma Viney Mark Jenkin CDRE Jaimie Hatcher Dan Curtis Matt Lipsett Rachel Rees-Scott Damian Abdilla Rob Graham Neisha Burton Brian Chase Sarah-Jane McBride	Director General Army Operations Staff Officer 1 Base Support, Army Headquarters Staff Officer 1 Infrastructure, Army Headquarters Chief of Staff Headquarters 1 Brigade Staff Officer 1 Military Engagement (Army) Deputy Director National Logistics Assistant Director Chief Operating Officer Finance Director General ADF Legal Services Legal Officer, Defence Legal Staff Officer 1 Defence Legal Legal Officer, Defence Legal Head Defence Support Organisation, Director General Base Coordination Support Services Director Base Projects and Plans Director Operations, Directorate of Training Area Management Manager Estate & Facilities Services - NT Business Manager Defence Support Central & West Directorate of Training Area Management Enviro Mgr, Directorate of Training Area Management Acting Base Support Manager RAAF Darwin Base Support Manager Roberston Barracks	
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	---	---	--

			Michael Walker	Defence Explosive Ordnance Logistics Review Project	
			AIRCDRE Anker Brodersen	Director General Estate Planning	
			John Kerwan	Director Estate Strategic Planning	
			Anthony Farrell	Director Base Planning	
			Simone Murray	Director External Land Planning	
			Brenin Presswell	Assistant Director External Land Planning	
			Allan Wiebe	Site Selection Board Coordinator	
			Tim Griffiths	Assistant Director Estate Strategic Planning	
			Alvin Lukban	Assistant Director General Estate Planning	
			LTCOL Liam Hale	Project Director -NT, Infrastructure Division	
			Darren Charman	Senior Project Officer - NT	
			BRIG John MacKenzie	Director General South East Asia, International Policy Division	
			Andrew Hodgkinson	Director Americas, International Policy Division	
			Faye Murray	Assistant Director Americas, International Policy Division	
			AIRCDRE Andrew Dowse	Director General Strategic Policy, Air Force	
			WGCDR Rohan Gaskill	Infrastructure Development Agency Air Force	
			GPCAPT Scott Winchester	Infrastructure Development Agency Air Force	
			AVM Neil Hart	Joint Capability Coordination	
			COL Scott Clingan	Director USFPI, Joint Capability Coordination	
			Garbis Avakian	Assistant Director USFPI, Joint Capability Coordination	
			James Tobin	Joint Capability Coordination	

Bi-lateral Infrastructure Workshop	2-3 December 2013	RAAF Base Tindal, Katherine NT	<p>GPCAPT Gary Paine</p> <p>SQNLDR John Force</p> <p>Sonya Arnold</p> <p>Sonya Dare</p> <p>David Marshall</p> <p>Faye Murray</p> <p>FSGT Stephen Rees</p> <p>Rachel Rees-Scott</p> <p>James Saltmer</p> <p>SQNLDR Peter Shipley</p> <p>GPCAPT Scott Winchester</p>	<p>Estate Planning</p> <p>Infrastructure Development Agency Air Force</p> <p>Business Manager, RAAF Tindal</p> <p>Assistant Director Estate Planning</p> <p>Base Services Manager RAAF Tindal</p> <p>Assistant Director Americas, International Policy Division</p> <p>Base Armament Manager RAAF Tindal</p> <p>Manager Estate & Facilities Services - NT</p> <p>Airfield Engineer</p> <p>Executive Officer RAAF Tindal</p> <p>Infrastructure Development Agency Air Force</p>	Chair Secretariat
	4 December 2013	RAAF Base Darwin, Darwin NT	<p>Sonya Arnold</p> <p>FSGT Mark Bonner</p> <p>FSGT Paul Crouch</p> <p>Sonya Dare</p> <p>SQNLDR Darren Dolan</p> <p>SQNLDR John Force</p> <p>FLGOFF Kenny Dylan</p> <p>Mr Ray Luke</p> <p>David Marshall</p> <p>FLGOFF Emily McSkimming</p>	<p>Business Manager, RAAF Tindal</p> <p>Base Activities Manager</p> <p>Aviation Fuels, Darwin</p> <p>Assistant Director Estate Planning</p> <p>Executive Officer, RAAF Darwin</p> <p>Infrastructure Development Agency Air Force</p> <p>Base Safety Officer</p> <p>Acting Base Services Manager</p> <p>Base Support Manager</p> <p>Airfield Engineer</p>	

			<p>Faye Murray</p> <p>FSGT Stephen Rees</p> <p>Rachel Rees-Scott</p> <p>James Saltmer</p> <p>SQNLDR Peter Shipley</p> <p>James Tobin</p> <p>SGT Stephen Watter</p> <p>GPCAPT Scott Winchester</p>	<p>Assistant Director Americas, International Policy Division</p> <p>Base Armament Manager RAAF Tindal</p> <p>Manager Estate & Facilities Services - NT</p> <p>Airfield Engineer</p> <p>Executive Officer RAAF Tindal</p> <p>Joint Capability Coordination</p> <p>Logistics</p> <p>Infrastructure Development Agency Air Force</p>	
	5 December 2013	RAAF Base Darwin, Darwin NT	<p>Sonya Dare</p> <p>SQNLDR John Force</p> <p>Faye Murray</p> <p>GPCAPT Gary Paine</p> <p>GPCAPT Scott Winchester</p>	<p>Assistant Director Estate Planning</p> <p>Infrastructure Development Agency Air Force</p> <p>Assistant Director Americas, International Policy Division</p> <p>Estate Planning Branch</p> <p>Infrastructure Development Agency Air Force</p>	
Bradshaw Field Training Area Capability Board	September 2013	Bradshaw Field Training Area	<p>Marc McGowan</p> <p>Kael daCosta</p> <p>MAJ Pat Powell</p>	<p>Assistant Director Training Areas and Ranges Policy</p> <p>Environment Training Area Manager Army</p> <p>Darwin representative</p>	
“Roundtable” Discussions	5 November 2013	Russell Offices, Canberra	<p>Chris Birrer</p> <p>COL Mitchell Kent</p> <p>GPCAPT Scott Winchester</p>	<p>Assistant Secretary Major Powers, International Policy</p> <p>Director International Engagement Army</p> <p>Infrastructure Development Agency Air Force</p>	

			Carolyn Spittle CDRE Mark Sackley Dan Curtis Simone Murray Sonya Dare Garbis Arvakian	Chief Finance Officer Director General Fuel Services Director Base Projects and Plans Director Estate Planning WA/SA/NT Assistant Director Estate Planning WA/SA/NT Assistant Director USFPI, Joint Capability Coordination	
Phase 2 Implementation Planning	20 December 2013	VTC from Russell Offices, Canberra	AIRCDRE Anker Brodersen Sonya Dare Dan Curtis CMDR David Neumann WGCDR Richard Alberts Tim Riley Faye Murray GPCAPT Scott Winchester SQNLDR John Force WGCDR Michael Thorne	Director General Estate Planning Assistant Director Estate Planning WA/SA/NT Director Base Projects and Plans Joint Logistics Command Joint Logistics Command Assistant Director Chief Operating Officer Finance Assistant Director Americas, International Policy Division Infrastructure Development Agency Air Force Infrastructure Development Agency Air Force Training and Exercise Branch	
Joint Facilities Working Group	May 2014	Brindabella Park, Canberra	Seima Darrow AIRCDRE Brodersen COL Noel Beutel Simone Murray	Director Enabling Support Coordination, USFPI Programme Office Programme Manager, USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office Director Estate Planning WA/SA/NT	

			Sonya Dare Allison Hinchcliffe	Assistant Director Estate Planning WA/SA/NT Assistant Director Training Area and Ranges Policy	
Joint Facilities Working Group	14 November 2014	Brindabella Park, Canberra	AIRCDRE Anker Brodersen Courtney Anderson Lucien Wells Sonya Dare LTCOL Matt Gallagher LTCOL Matthew Quinn LTCOL Daven Pettersen	USFPI Programme Manager USFPI Programme Office Assistant Director, International Policy Estate Planning NT, Infrastructure Division Director Plans - Army Staff Officer 1 Infrastructure Army Headquarters Staff Officer 1 International Engagement Army Headquarters	

RAAF Base Darwin Planning Charrette	8-12 December 2014	RAAF Base Darwin, Darwin NT	Mr Sonya Dare SQNLDR John Force Mr Dennis Keating WGCDR Wesley Perrett Mr Brian Chase Mr Paul Roberts Mr Geoff Roberts Mr Ray Luke MAJ Kylie Warner WGCDR Nick Edwards GPCAPT Anne Borzycki Ms Justine Nordin Ms Jan Nordin Mr Michael Walker CMDR Greg Mapson Ms Robyn Maurer Mr Johannes Bormann Mr Dave Parry	Estate Planning NT, Infrastructure Division Infrastructure Development Agency Air Force Capital Facilities Liaison, Infrastructure Division Senior ADF Officer Base Support Operations Manager Regional Estate Planning Officer Joint Logistics Command, Fuels Base Support Manager Marine Rotational Force-Darwin Liaison Officer Deputy Director Air, Joint Logistics Command USFPI Programme Office Manager Estate & Facilities Services Marine Rotational Force-Darwin Liaison Officer Director Explosive Ordnance Reform Marine Rotational Force-Darwin Coordination Team Officer In Charge Regional Environmental Manager Regional Defence Security Authority Representative Regional Health Director	
Joint Facilities Working Group	17-18 February 2015	US Pacific Command. Camp Smith, Honolulu	AIRCDRE Anker Brodersen Ms Sonya Dare Mr Lucien Wells	USFPI Programme Manager Director Enabling Support, USFPI Programme Office Assistant Director, International Policy Division	

			Mr Michael Carey Mr Craig Patterson Ms Amanda Toms Ms Rachel Rees-Scott WGCDR Nick Edwards WGCDR Rohan Gaskill Mr Ben Olesen Tim Riley	Legal Officer, Defence Legal Executive Director, Capital Facilities & Infrastructure Director Estate Planning, WA SA & NT Director, Defence Support Operations Deputy Director Air, Joint Logistics Command Consulate Official, Honolulu USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office	
Video Conference, Initial Business Case	18 August 2015	Brindabella Business Park, Canberra Airport	Ms Amanda Toms Ms Sonya Dare Mr Ben Olesen	Director Estate Planning, WA SA & NT Director Enabling Support, USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office	
Robertson Barracks Planning Charrette	14-18 September 2015	RAAF Base Darwin, Darwin NT	Ms Sonya Dare MAJ Kylie Warner Ms Justine Nordin Mr Jan Nordin Mr Ben Olesen LTCOL Darryl Bridgeman Mr Paul Roberts Mr Andrew Horrigan Ms Tracey Biscoe CAPT Aaron McMahon	Director Enabling Support, USFPI Programme Office Marine Rotational Force-Darwin Liaison Officer Manager Estate & Facilities Services Marine Rotational Force-Darwin Liaison Officer USFPI Programme Office Chief Of Staff Headquarters 1 st Brigade Regional Estate Planning Officer Base Support Manager – Robertson Barracks Regional Environmental Manager Staff Officer, Headquarters 1 st Brigade	

Video Conference, RAAF Base Darwin		Brindabella Business Park, Canberra Airport	BRIG Tim Bayliss Ms Belinda McNamara Mr Lachlan McGovern Ms Anna Koestenbauer Ms Sonya Dare Ms Lana Roberts Mr Ben McLean Ms Katrina Edwards Ms Natasha Moore Mr Greg Miller Mr Ben Olesen Mr Michael Carey Ms Melissa Jones	USFPI Programme Manager Director US Alliance Policy, International Policy Div International Policy Division International Policy Division USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office Defence Legal Defence Legal	Chair
Video Conference, RAAF Base Tindal		Brindabella Business Park, Canberra Airport	Ms Belinda McNamara Mr Lachlan McGovern Ms Anna Koestenbauer Ms Sarah Brown Ms Sonya Dare Ms Lana Roberts Mr Ben McLean Ms Katrina Edwards	Director US Alliance Policy, International Policy Div International Policy Division International Policy Division USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office	Chair

			Ms Natasha Moore Mr Greg Miller Mr Ben Olesen Mr Michael Carey Ms Melissa Jones	USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office Defence Legal Defence Legal	
Video Conference, RAAF Bases Darwin & Tindal		Brindabella Business Park, Canberra Airport	BRIG Tim Bayliss Ms Belinda McNamara Mr Lachlan McGovern Ms Anna Koestenbauer Ms Sarah Brown Ms Sonya Dare Mr Ben McLean Ms Katrina Edwards Ms Natasha Moore Mr Greg Miller Mr Ben Olesen Mr Michael Carey Ms Melissa Jones	USFPI Programme Manager Director US Alliance Policy, International Policy Div International Policy Division International Policy Division USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office Defence Legal Defence Legal	Chair

			Ms Natasha Moore Mr Ben Olesen	USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office	
Northern Territory Facilities Review including Training Areas & Ranges	17-22 April 2016	RAAF Base Darwin, Robertson Barracks, Defence Establishment Berrimah, Kangaroo Flats Training Area, Mt Bundey Training Area	Sonya Dare Rae Noble John Pring MAJ M Gavican MAJ K Warner	USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office Estate & Infrastructure Group (Darwin) Force Posture Support and Coordination Team Logistics Officer	
RAAF Base Tindal pavement design	17-22 April 2016	RAAF Base Tindal	Sarah Brown SQNLDR Ken Edwards Ben Olesen	USFPI Programme Office Infrastructure Asset Development Branch USFPI Programme Office	
Joint Facilities Working Group	26-27 April 2016	Brindabella Business Park, Canberra Airport	BRIG Tim Bayliss COL Grant Halsted LTCOL Karl Reynolds GPCAPT Ron Tilley SQNLDR Ken Edwards	USFPI Programme Manager Capital Facilities & Infrastructure Branch, Infrastructure Division Capital Facilities & Infrastructure Branch, Infrastructure Division Infrastructure Development Agency, RAAF Infrastructure Development Agency, RAAF USFPI Programme Office	

			Ms Sarah Brown Ms Sonya Dare Mr Benjamin McLean Mr Tom Vogt Mr Ben Olesen Mr John Pring Mrs Lisa Huggins	USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office Estate Planning Branch, Infrastructure Division	
Mobile Tactical Field Exchange enabling infrastructure	30 May – 03 June 2016	Robertson Barracks	Ben McLean	USFPI Programme Office	
“Pathfinder project” detailed design charrette	12-13 July 2016	Hilton Hotel, Darwin	Ms Sonya Dare Mrs Rae Noble Mr Ben McLean Mr Ben Olesen Mr John Pring SQNLDR Ken Edwards SQNLDR Darren Prior Mr Jan Nordin	USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office Infrastructure Development Agency - RAAF RAAF Base Darwin RAAF Base Darwin	

			Mr Jeff Grose Mr Anthony Butler Mr Mark Turner FLTLT Carmen Chong Mr Mark van Zomeren	RAAF Base Darwin Defence Support – NT/K Environment and Engineering Branch, Infrastructure Division Environment and Engineering Branch, Infrastructure Division Environment and Engineering Branch, Infrastructure Division	
RAAF Darwin fuel charrette	14-15 July 2016	RAAF Darwin, Darwin	Ms Sonya Dare Mrs Rae Noble Mr Ben McLean Mr Ben Olesen Mr John Pring Mrs Rae Noble SQNLDR Ken Edwards Mr Jan Nordin Mr Anthony Butler FSGT Paul Crouch	USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office Infrastructure Development Agency – RAAF RAAF Base Darwin RAAF Base Darwin RAAF Base Darwin	
Joint Facilities Working Group	17-18 August 2016	Forde Island, Honolulu	Ms Sarah Brown Ms Sonya Dare	USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office	Co-chair

			Mr John Pring Mrs Rae Noble SQNLDR Ken Edwards	USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office USFPI Programme Office	
--	--	--	--	--	--

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: China Defence Relationship

Question reference number: 67

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- a) Could Defence please provide an overview of the current state of the bilateral defence relationship with China, including a summary of any key milestones in the relationship in the past decade?
 - i. How would Defence characterise the current level of strategic and senior-level cooperation?
 - ii. How would Defence characterise the current level of practical military to military cooperation?
 - iii. What are the potential growth areas for the bilateral defence relationship?
- b) Could Defence please provide a list of regular bilateral meetings, activities and exercises with China?
- c) With respect to the annual Australia-China Strategic Dialogue, could Defence please:
 - i. Outline the role of the Strategic Dialogue.
 - ii. Confirm the date and location of the most recent iteration of the Strategic Dialogue.
 - iii. Confirm the participants in the most recent iteration of the Strategic Dialogue.
- d) With respect to the most recent iteration of the Australia-China Strategic Dialogue, including the visit to Australia by the Chief of the General Staff Department of China's People's Liberation, Army General Fang Fenghui, to attend the Strategic Dialogue:
 - i. The Australian reported on 2 December 2015 ('Top brass strengthens military ties with China') that a Chinese communique issued after the meeting said that: "The visit has produced major outcomes". What were the agreed outcomes of the Strategic Dialogue as well as General Fang Fenghui's visit more broadly?
 - ii. The Xinhua News Agency reported on 2 December 2015 that:

"Touting the agreement on joint counter-terrorism operations, peace-keeping training and exchange of military personnel as a massive win for peace in the region, Binskin said a prosperous Asia-Pacific was in the interests of both Australia and China."

- 1. What agreements were reached with respect to joint counter-terrorism operations, peace-keeping training and exchange of military personnel?

2. Were any other agreements reached beyond joint counter-terrorism operations, peace-keeping training and exchange of military personnel? If so, what?
 3. Was Xinhua's report an accurate description of Air Chief Marshal Binksin's comments?
 - i. Did Air Chief Marshal Binksin provide those or similar comments to the media? If so, were the comments provided in written or verbal form?
 - ii. Please provide a copy of any written remarks or comments that Air Chief Marshal Binksin provided to the media and a list of which individuals and/or organisations were provided with those remarks or comments.
- (e) The Australian reported on 2 December 2015 ('Top brass strengthens military ties with China') that: *"The Chinese media received a joint communique in which Senator Payne said Australia China relations were at a historical high and the talks were very fruitful. Australia placed high importance on friendly ties with China's armed forces."*
- i. What is Defence's assessment of Australia-China relations? Are they are a 'historical high'?
 - ii. Is it the case that Minister Payne provided comments to the Chinese media that indicated that Australia-China relations were at a historical high and the talks were very fruitful?
 1. Please provide a copy of any comments provided to the Chinese or Australian media that are attributed to Minister Payne with respect to the General Fang Fenghui's visit and the recent Australia-China Strategic Dialogue.
 - iii. Was Defence involved in drafting the 'joint communique' referred to by The Australian – or a similar document (regardless of its formal name)?
 1. If so, please advise when was it drafted, who drafted it, who approved it, when was it sent to the Minister's office, when it was approved by the Minister's office, and who it was distributed to.
 2. Please provide a copy of the document.
 - iv. The Australian reported on 2 December 2015 ('Top brass strengthens military ties with China') that:
In the advisory notes sent to the Chinese embassy, Defence said General Fang was in Canberra for the 18th annual China-Australia Defence Strategic Dialogue. "The dialogue is the cornerstone of the Australia-China defence engagement program and provides a valuable opportunity for senior leaders to engage on a range of strategic issues and reflect on the progress of our bilateral defence engagement," Defence said. "The dialogue is, other than ministerial counterpart meetings, the most senior Defence dialogue we hold with China."
 1. What was contained in these notes, who drafted them, who approved them and when were they provided to the Chinese Embassy?
 2. Were these notes provided to any other individual or entity? If so, please provide a list of who received the advisory notes and when.
 3. Please provide a copy of the advisory notes.

Answer:

(a) Australia-China defence cooperation includes strategic dialogue, practical cooperation activities, personnel exchanges and training and educational exchanges. Over the last five years, the defence relationship has grown from a modest base and is currently at its most active state since Defence engagement with the People's Liberation Army (PLA) commenced. The key milestones in the defence relationship over the past decade have been:

- The continuation of the annual Australia-China Defence Strategic Dialogue, with the 18th iteration held in 2015.
- Visits to Australia by the Vice Chairman of the PLA Central Military Commission in 2010 and 2014.
- Regular reciprocal ship visits—most recently with a visit to Zhanjiang, China by HMA Ships *Stuart* and *Arunta* from 31 October to 2 November 2015, and a visit to Brisbane by a PLA Navy counter-piracy task group from 2 to 6 January 2016.
- Establishing the humanitarian assistance and disaster relief table-top exercise COOPERATION SPIRIT in 2010, which is now a quadrilateral exercise involving New Zealand and the United States. The most recent iteration was hosted by Australia in November 2015.
- Visits to China by the Minister for Defence in 2012 and 2014.
- Establishing the trilateral (Australia-China-United States) environmental survival skills exercise KOWARI in 2014, with a subsequent iteration held in 2015.
- Establishing the bilateral (Australia-China) adventure training exercise PANDAROO in 2015.

(a)(i) Strategic and senior-level cooperation between Defence and the PLA is productive and occurs regularly-allowing senior leaders to engage in open and frank discussion on strategic issues of common concern.

(a)(ii) Growing from a modest base, practical military-to-military cooperation between Defence and the PLA is currently at its most active state since Defence engagement with the PLA commenced. Recent milestones have included the trilateral (Australia-China-United States) environmental survival skills exercise KOWARI and the bilateral (Australia-China) adventure training exercise PANDAROO.

(a)(iii) Further to our practical military cooperation, we assess areas such as humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, peace-keeping, search and rescue, and education and training to have potential for growth in the bilateral defence relationship.

(b)

- Australia-China Defence Strategic Dialogue. This is our peak forum for senior-level engagement on strategic issues and consideration of bilateral defence engagement activities. It is co-hosted by the Secretary of Defence, the Chief of the Defence Force and the PLA Chief of Joint Staff. Australia hosted the most recent (18th) iteration on 30 November 2015.

- Australia-China Defence Coordination Dialogue. This is a working-level dialogue which supports the annual Defence Strategic Dialogue. Its primary purpose is to discuss and plan for bilateral defence engagement activities.
- Exercise KOWARI. This is a trilateral (Australia- China-United States) environmental survival skills exercise. Australia hosted the first and second iterations in 2014 and 2015.
- Exercise PANDAROO. This is a bilateral (Australia-China) adventure training exercise. Australia hosted the first iteration in 2015.
- Exercise COOPERATION SPIRIT (which has also been known as PHOENIX SPIRIT). This is a tabletop exercise which is generally focused on humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, but has also been conducted as a search and rescue exercise. In recent years, it has evolved into a quadrilateral exercise involving New Zealand and the United States.

(c)(i) The annual dialogue offers the leadership of the Australian Defence Organisation and China's Peoples' Liberation Army the opportunity to engage in open and frank discussion on issues of common concern and to discuss a forward program of bilateral defence engagement activities.

(c)(ii) The most recent iteration of the Defence Strategic Dialogue was held in Canberra on 30 November 2015.

(c)(iii) The most recent iteration of the Defence Strategic Dialogue was co-chaired by Air Chief Marshal Mark Binskin (Chief of the Defence Force), Mr Dennis Richardson (Secretary of Defence) and General Fang Fenghui (Chief of the General Staff, PLA). Other participants on the Australian side were Vice Admiral David Johnston (Chief of Joint Operations), Mr Peter Baxter (Deputy Secretary Strategy), Major General John Frewen (Acting Vice Chief of the Defence Force), Mr Scott Dewar (First Assistant Secretary International Policy) and Major General Rick Burr (Deputy Chief of Army). Other participants on the Chinese side were His Excellency Mr Ma Zhaoxu (China's Ambassador to Australia), Major General Qiu Jingping (Director General Office, General Staff Department), Major General He Ping (Political Commissar, Military Intelligence Department), Rear Admiral Guan Youfei (Director, Foreign Affairs Office), Rear Admiral Wang Yongxiang (Deputy Director, Operations Department) and Senior Colonel Wang Jingguo (China's Defence Attache to Australia). Please note that these were the ranks and positions held by individuals at the time the Dialogue was conducted.

(d)(i) The Defence Strategic Dialogue offered senior leaders the opportunity to engage in open and frank discussion on issues of common concern and to discuss a forward program of bilateral defence engagement activities. Among the potential activities discussed were peacekeeping training, counter-terrorism and officer exchanges.

(d)(ii)(1) No agreements were reached.

(d)(ii)(2) No. Potential defence engagement activities were discussed.

(d)(ii)(3) No.

(d)(ii)(3)(i) Air Chief Marshal Binskin did not provide any comments to the media.

(d)(ii)(3)(ii) Air Chief Marshal Binskin did not provide any comments to the media.

(e)(i) Australia's bilateral defence relationship with China is an important component of our broader bilateral relationship, and is supported through practical cooperation and engagement.

Over the last five years, the Australia-China defence relationship has grown from a modest base and is currently at its most active state since Defence engagement with the PLA commenced.

(e)(ii) No. Minister Payne did not provide any comments to the Chinese or Australian media.

(e)(ii)(1). Minister Payne did not provide any comments to the Chinese or Australian media.

(e)(iii) See answer at (e)(ii).

(e)(iii)(1) N/A

(a)(iii)(2) N/A

(e)(iv)(1) (2) (3)

At the request of the Chinese Embassy, Defence granted approval to members of the delegation and some representatives of the Chinese media to record General Fang's inspection of the ADF honour guard.

Specific details of and background for this event were provided to the Chinese Embassy on 27 November 2015 in the format of a media alert. This document was drafted by the Department of Defence and was not provided to any other person or organisation.

\

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Addition Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Gulfstream G550 Acquisition

Question reference number: 68

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

According to media reports, the purchase of two Gulfstream G550 aircraft was recently confirmed by Defence in a statement to the media.

- (a) For the record – has the Australian Government agreed to purchase two Gulfstream G550 aircraft through the US Air Force?
- (b) When did the Australian Government enter into this arrangement?
- (c) What is the cost of two aircraft? Please provide costs for procurement and for through life support.
- (d) According to media reports, Defence confirmed that: “The aircraft will be modified to provide an airborne intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance and electronic warfare (ISREW) capability to support ADF operations for Australia.”
 - (i) Does the ADF currently have any other ISREW capabilities and/or platforms?
 - (ii) Will the G550s replace an existing capability or platform, or will they augment current capabilities and platforms?
 - (iii) What other platforms were considered for acquisition as part of the process leading to the decision to procure the Gulfstreams?
 - (iv) What additional or unique capabilities do the Gulfstreams offer over existing capabilities? In layman’s terms – why did Defence and the Government reach the view that they were required and what will they be used for?
- (e) How long did the acquisition process take? When did it begin, when did it conclude and on what date did Government make a decision to proceed to purchase the aircraft?
- (f) What process was used to select the Gulfstreams? Was it a two-pass process, a Competitive Evaluation Process, or some other process?
- (g) When are the Gulfstreams due to be delivered to the ADF – and when are they expected to become operational?
- (h) Where are the two G550s expected to be based?

Answer:

- (a) Yes.
- (b) December 2015.
- (c) A\$149.704 million.
- (d)
 - (i) Yes
 - (ii) The G550s will be a new airborne Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance and Electronic Warfare capability.
 - (iii) The US Air Force and Defence considered a number of candidate systems; however, the Gulfstream met all key requirements.
 - (iv) The G550s will be a key enabler for many of the modern capabilities planned to be acquired within the Defence White Paper 2016.
- (e) The acquisition process began in December 2015 and is ongoing.
- (f) The Two-Pass process.
- (g) The first mission system equipped G550 aircraft is currently due to be delivered to the ADF in 2020 and is planned to become operational within six months of delivery.
- (h) RAAF Base Edinburgh.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Western Australian Bushfires – Defence Involvement

Question reference number: 69

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (1) With respect to the bushfires in Western Australia's south west in the first week of January 2016, was Defence asked to assist with the bushfires in any capacity?
 - (a) If YES:
 - (i) What was the nature of that request, and what was the ADF's response?
 - (ii) When was Defence asked to assist?
 - (iii) Who was involved in those discussions?
 - (iv) What decision was made?
 - (v) Who made that decision?
 - (vi) Why was that decision taken?
 - (b) If NO:
 - (i) Can Defence please confirm that no contact was made with anyone in Defence about possible ADF assistance?
 - (ii) What assets and personnel does the ADF have available in Western Australia that could be used for bushfire assistance?
 - (iii) Does Defence have personnel and assets in other states that could be mobilised quickly?
 - (iv) Have Western Australian personnel and equipment been deployed on Defence Aid to the Civil Community (DACC) tasks related to bushfire assistance in the past three years? If so, please provide an overview of the nature of that assistance?
 - (v) Would the ADF have been able to provide assistance during the bushfires, if asked?
 - (vi) Could Defence please describe the process for responding to requests for assistance during domestic emergencies?
 - (vii) DACC has been utilised in a number of recent major bushfire events in Australia, including the Black Saturday bushfires in Victoria in 2009, in NSW and Tasmania in January 2013 and in South Australian in January 2015. Can Defence please provide an overview of the types of assistance provided during these bushfires?

Answer:

(1)(a) Yes.

- (i) The request was to provide an ADF Liaison Officer to the Support Operations Centre (SOC) until further notice. The ADF's response was to provide two ADF Liaison Officers (ADFLOs) from Joint Operational Support Staff Western Australia (JOSS-WA) to the SOC.
- (ii) 8 January 2016.
- (iii) JOSS-WA and the Western Australia Department of Fire and Emergency Services.
- (iv) The decision was made to provide two ADFLOs to the SOC until further notice.
- (v) The Manager of JOSS.
- (vi) This kind of request is not unusual. The ADFLOs provide liaison and planning assistance in case Defence support is needed. JOSS are the key interface between Defence and States and Territories. JOSS conduct regular liaison between Defence and civil agencies on a variety of issues, including DACC. JOSS represents Defence on civilian State and Territory level emergency management committees and on district level sub-committees, where its role is to provide policy advice and guidance. Once ADFLOs are in position they are well placed to be able to understand state authorities' needs and requests and to ensure they are passed on through the Defence chain.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Armidale Maintenance Contract

Question reference number: 70

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

- a) It was reported in the Cairns Post on 12 January 2016 that the Cairns Marine Industry had lost a major maintenance contract to Singapore. It was further reported that the sustainment of the Navy's four Armidale Class Patrol Boats based in Cairns would now be undertaken in Singapore by a Singaporean company. Is this correct?
- b) It has been reported that Navy's principal contractor, Serco, had renegotiated its sustainment contract with Defence and would end its Cairns maintenance program in 2017 – five years early. Is this correct?
- c) What was the process for tender for the sustainment contract of the Armidale Class Patrol Boats in Cairns?
 - i. Did the Cairns Marine Industry have the opportunity to tender for the contract?
 - ii. What other Australian companies were afforded an opportunity to tender?
- d) In Defence's estimation, will the loss of this contract from Cairns have a negative impact on Cairns, and Australian industry?
- e) Which company/or companies in Cairns will be undertaking routine maintenance on the Armidale Class Patrol Boats?
 - i. How was this work awarded?
 - ii. Was there an open tender process?
 - iii. Does the successful company have the capability to undertake the sustainment work?
- f) Does the loss of this work from Cairns prejudice or undermine Cairns bid for the Pacific Patrol Boat tender, which Government has said will be announced 'very early this year'?
- g) It is understood that there is a project office located in Cairns; how has this loss affected this office and what is the future of this office?

Answer:

- a) No.
- b) Yes.
- c) The Armidale Class Patrol Boat build and in service support contract went through an open tender process and was awarded in 2003. It was a combined ship build and in service support contract with DMS Maritime Services, now wholly owned by SERCO as the winner of the role of Prime Contractor.
 - i. The Cairns Marine Industry did not have the capacity to provide a competitive tender for the sustainment contract. However, they continue to be allocated routine ship maintenance work by the Prime Contractor. This places the Cairns Marine Industry either at or slightly in excess of its current production capacity.
 - ii. Austal was the only Australian supplier with the ability to reliably carry out the Remediation Program currently being conducted in Singapore. Austal were unable to come to an agreed contract with the Prime Contractor, SERCO, preventing them from submitting a tender. The prospect of the Commonwealth directly contracting with Austal had been examined, however, Intellectual Property issues to the repair methodology prevented this option from being progressed.

In the first quarter of 2016, Defence directed SERCO to reassess the Australian market and competitively tender for an Australian based remediation program. From the process, Austal, based in Henderson, WA was selected.
- d) Cairns did not lose this contract.
- e) There are two principal companies involved in routine Armidale Class Patrol Boat maintenance. They are:
 - NORSHIP, who also maintain the Australian Border Force - Cape Class Patrol Boats, and the Australian Border Force Bay Class Patrol Boats. Additionally NORSHIP also execute major refits on the Pacific Patrol Boat fleet.
 - BSE Marine Services, who carry out maintenance on Armidales in water only as their facilities do not currently have the capability to dock (ie, take out of water onto cradles on land) an Armidale Class Patrol Boat.
- i. Routine maintenance is continually being awarded by the Prime Contractor (SERCO), and that work is allocated on the basis of production capacity, facilities available (for docking), compliance with WH&S regulations, labour skills-set required, etc. There is routine or preventative, as well as normal corrective (defects) maintenance in the Cairns Marine Industry work content.

- ii. For routine maintenance across the year, the Prime Contractor runs a competitive process, and receives responses from the local industry.
 - iii. All three shipyards in Cairns (ie, NORSHIP, BSE, & Tropical Reef) have the ability to execute routine maintenance on Armidale Class Patrol Boats in water. Only NORSHIP and Tropical Reef Shipyard have the docking facilities that enable an Armidale Class Patrol Boat (ACPB) to be lifted out of the water safely, for land-based docking maintenance.
- f) Cairns did not lose any work.
- The allocation of the remediation program to ST Marine in Singapore was not part of any assessment in the Patrol Boat tender.
- g) Cairns did not lose any work as stated above.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: 3 RAR Parachute Capability

Question reference number: 71

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (1) Can Army please advise what savings were realised by the transfer of the conventional parachute capability from 3 RAR to 2 Commando?
- (2) What were the costs incurred through transferring the Army's parachute training school to Special Operations Command? Can Defence please advise the current status of that school?
- (3) How are the former parachute ground training facilities of 3 RAR being utilised?
- (4) Has the upgrade of those facilities (valued at \$3 million in 2006) been undertaken?
- (5) The expansion of the RAAF Air Mobility Capability through the acquisition of C-17's, C-130's and C-27J's has transformed the ADF's air-lift capability. Does this not significantly change the assumptions made regarding the viability of a conventional parachute capability in 2010?
- (6) How has the cost of airborne training requirements overall for Army changed since the transfer of the parachute capability to 2 Commando?

Answer:

- (1) Despite a reduction in military static line training as a result of the transfer of the conventional parachute capability to Special Operations Command, corresponding cost savings were offset by changes to parachute training to enhance special operations capability. For example, the Army now runs more military free fall and ram air parachute static line training. The transfer of the capability from 3 RAR to 2 Commando did not realise any significant savings; however, the current 2 Commando parachute capability exceeds that of 3 RAR.

- (2) The transfer of the Parachute Training School to Special Operations Command did not incur any costs because there was no change to the school location. The Parachute Training School is still a direct command unit of Headquarters Special Operations Command.

- (3)-(4) The only upgrade of parachute ground training facilities at Holsworthy Barracks occurred in the mid 2000s. The upgrade was undertaken as part of the Special Operations Working Accommodation and Base Redevelopment Stage 1 for the establishment of the commando capability.

The parachute training facilities at 3 RAR's former Kapyong Lines in Holsworthy Barracks were not upgraded prior to the demolition of Kapyong Lines in 2013 under the Moorebank Units Relocation project.

The only remaining parachute training facility at Holsworthy Barracks is the old C130 Hercules emplaning/deplaning trainer, which was relocated within the base for wider Defence use.

- (5) The decision to transfer the parachute capability was made after considering a number of factors related to the requirement for, and utility of, the conventional parachute capability. Although a contributing factor, changes in Air Force air mobility capacity do not alter the requirement for parachute capability.
- (6) The initial cost changes occurred at transfer of capability from Forces Command to Special Operations Command with the inception of fixed variable contract requirements. Other cost fluctuations are dependent on operational tempo, surge capability requirements and additional training requirements as directed.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Climate Change

Question reference number: 72

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

- (1) Is the Department preparing a climate change adaption strategy?
- (2) Is the Department participating in any inter-departmental or inter-agency climate change working groups? If so please provide details.
- (3) Has the Department undertaken any analysis of climate change impacts on military base locations, and base capacity (force posture)?
- (4) With respect to the White Paper process, can Defence please advise:
 - (a) How has climate change been incorporated and mainstreamed into national strategic and military planning?
 - (b) Has there been any analysis of climate change impacts in our primary operational environment (POE) such as key neighbours like Indonesia, PNG, Philippines, and Pacific Island Countries?
 - (c) Has there been any analysis on how climate change impacts will impact on force structure because of increasing requirements for stabilisation operations and disaster relief?
 - (d) as there been any analysis or inclusion of climate change in military doctrine (e.g. Disaster relief doctrine or aid to the civil community)?
- (5) Are there any mandated renewable energy targets for military bases?
- (6) Has the Department conducted any risk assessment of sea-level rises on military bases? If so, what were the findings and which bases are most at risk?
- (7) Has the Department conducted any risk assessment of extreme weather on military bases? If so, what were the findings and which bases are most at risk?
- (8) Are there any mandated fuel and energy efficiency goals in the purchase of major military hardware and platforms – e.g. the use of bio-fuels?
- (9) Has the Department undertaken any analysis of climate change risks to critical civilian infrastructure and civilian workforce and the resultant impacts on military operations and training? If so, what were the findings?
- (10) What sustainable procurement practices has the Department implemented – e.g. energy efficient civilian vehicle fleets, energy efficient lighting, heating, waste reduction strategies, etc.?

Answers:

- (1) No. Defence considers climate change risk under existing business functions rather than as an independent issue. Defence prepares and plans for the consequences of events regardless of their origins, including extreme weather events.
- (2) Yes, Defence is represented on the Australian Government Disaster and Climate Resilience Reference Group.
- (3) Yes – further details provided in responses to (4); (a); (b); (c) and (d) below.
- (4)
 - (a) The 2016 Defence White Paper is based on a comprehensive assessment of the full range of security challenges and issues and their causes, including climate change, which Australia is likely to face to 2035. The 2016 White Paper is the primary Defence guidance for capability and resource planning.
 - (b) The 2016 White Paper notes that climate change will be a major challenge for countries in our immediate neighborhood. Refer to point 2.68 of the 2016 Defence White Paper for detail. Australia will continue to play a leading role in providing humanitarian assistance and security assistance when requested.
 - (c) The 2016 Defence White Paper and its accompanying Integrated Investment Program detail plans to enhance a range of capabilities that will strengthen our ability to assist our neighbors into the future through humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. This includes strengthened amphibious, air and sea lift, and maritime surveillance and response capabilities.
 - (d) The Defence Aid to the Civil Community Manual is currently under review. This will incorporate Defence White paper policy changes.
- (5) Defence complies with the Energy Efficiency in Government Operations Policy and seeks to achieve tenant light and power central services targets. Defence is implementing sub metering across the Defence estate to monitor and manage energy. Renewable energy projects, such as the installation of solar photovoltaic systems are being delivered across the Defence estate where possible.
- (6) Yes. Defence has completed a two stage study led by Estate and Infrastructure Group to determine mitigation and adaptation strategies to guard against the impact of sea level rise, flooding, storm surge and coastal erosion. Stage one of the study was completed in 2011. The second stage of the study, which examined 14 selected Defence sites, was completed in 2013. The findings of the study are classified and will not be publically released. A de-classified case study has been provided to the National Climate Adaptation Research Facility Coast Adapt website at the following link:
https://coastadapt.com.au/sites/default/files/case_studies/CS09_Defence_risk_assessment.pdf

A similar study is currently being conducted into the impact of sea level rise, flooding, storm surge and coastal erosion on selected Defence training areas. The study is due for completion in mid 2018.

- (7) Yes. A study into the exposure of Defence bases to flood, fire and storm events was conducted by the Vice Chief of Defence Force Group in 2014. The findings of the study are classified. Other relevant studies are detailed in the answer to question (6) above.
- (8) There are no Australian Government mandated fuel and energy goals on which to base standards of military platform efficiency. Notwithstanding, the Royal Australian Navy (RAN) considers propulsion system efficiency as part of procurement processes in order to maximise platform range and endurance, contain operating costs, and meet future capability requirements.

Moreover, the RAN, with the assistance of Fuel Services Branch and Defence Science and Technology Group, has certified the use of alternative fuels on RAN ships. Alternative fuel, derived from a bio-mass feedstock, was provided by the USN to RAN ships participating in the Rim of the Pacific (RIMPAC) exercise conducted in June 2016. Fuel Services Branch has amended the Australian Defence Standard for Navy Fuels to include alternative fuels manufactured via the USN approved pathways. Once the Australian Defence Standard Fuel standard is released, suppliers will be able to supply these types of alternative fuels in competition with the broader market.

- (9) As part of the studies mentioned in the answer to question (6) above, Estate and Infrastructure Group addressed the impact of climate change on civilian infrastructure that has a direct input to capability produced by Defence bases and training areas such as access bridges and roads. The findings of these studies are classified.

Analysis of critical civilian infrastructure was also conducted as part of the Force Structure Review accompanying the 2016 Defence White Paper. The findings of these studies are classified.

The Vice Chief of the Defence Force Group, supported by the Defence Science and Technology Group, continues to monitor climate risks as part of routine preparedness risk analysis, including risks to critical infrastructure. The findings of these analyses are classified.

- (10) Defence has an environmental policy, strategy and plan which fosters a Defence wide approach to the sustainable conduct of Defence activities on land, sea and in the air in support of Defence capability. The current plan is available online at the following link: <http://www.defence.gov.au/environment/>

Defence has implemented the Smart Infrastructure Manual, which aims to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the estate.

The Smart Infrastructure Manual enables Defence to take a consistent approach to the assessment of options for design and delivery of Defence Infrastructure taking into account whole of life cost savings, capitalising on lessons learnt, and ecologically sustainable development opportunities.

Defence also continues to implement measures and initiatives to improve resource efficiency and reduce utility costs, including lighting retrofit projects and installation of solar photovoltaic systems on Defence bases, where possible.

The Defence Science and Technology Group is researching a range of energy related technologies. These include alternative fuels, fuel reduction measures and improving the efficiency of alternative power sources, such as batteries.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Fleet Maritime Services Contract

Question reference number: 73

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) Is the Fleet Maritime Services Contract (FMSC) currently funded from within the budget of the Royal Australian Navy?
- (b) Is it the case that the FMSC is supported by the Contractor Asset Acquisition Program (CAAP), which represents the lease costs for vessels?
- (c) Can Defence please advise what the cost of the FMSC and CAAP is to Navy?
- (d) Can Defence please advise how many vessels will be built under these programs to 2020-21?
- (e) Can Defence please advise how many vessels will be leased under these programs to 2020-21?
- (f) Can Defence advise what opportunities exist for the Australian shipbuilding industry in the FMSC and CAAP?
- (g) Have any of the recent inquiries into the Australian Shipbuilding Industry (i.e. Winter Review, RAND Report) contemplated the actual and potential impacts of the FMSC and CAAP on Australian shipyards?
- (h) Is Australian industry capable of building the vessels planned under the FMSC and CAAP?
- (i) Has the FMSC and CAAP been considered by the current Defence White Paper planning team or in the development of the forthcoming Naval Shipbuilding Plan?

Answer:

- (a) Yes.
- (b) Yes.
- (c) For the 2015/16 financial year, the budgeted cost of the FMSC and CAAP is \$61.376 million
- (d) 152 vessels are scheduled to be procured under the CAAP up until FMSC end date of October 2020.
- (e) 150 of these vessels are scheduled to be chartered (leased).

- (f) Responses are evaluated by the FMSC CAAP Team under Government Value for Money (VFM) guidelines. Approvals for all acquisitions are sought from Deputy Chief of Navy (DCN)/Head of Navy Capability (HNC). The majority of CAAP vessels (140 in number) have/will be sourced from Australian builders/suppliers. All vessels are maintained and/or operated by DMS Maritime Pty Ltd, an Australian company.
- (g) No. Recent major inquiries have not directly considered these programs.
- (h) To date the majority of the 140 vessels sourced through the CAAP, have been less than 15 metres in length and have been built in boat yards in Australia. A number of the specialist vessels over 15 meters in length, such as tugs, have been procured in open competition, by DMS Australia, from overseas.
- (i) Yes, all of Defence's future acquisition and sustainment requirements were considered as part of the planning for the 2016 Defence White Paper and Integrated Investment Program.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Priority Industry Funds and Grants

Question reference number: 74

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) With reference to Defence's answer to Question on Notice 90 at Supplementary Budget Estimates on 21 October 2015, have any grants or projects requiring priority industry capability development fund (PICDF) funding been approved to date?
- (b) How much will the current round of Defence Innovation Realisation Fund (DIRF) grants cost the Department?
- (c) The recent report by the Defence Sub Committee of the Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, entitled 'Principles and Practice-Australian Defence Industry Exports', urged that Defence Attachés based in foreign missions should play a much stronger role in the work of the Australian Military Sales Office (AMSO). What is Defence's response to this recommendation?
- (d) Since AMSO became a function within CASG, has there been any change in its work, structure or funding? If so, what changes have been made?

Answer:

- (a) Since the previous response provided in Question on Notice 90 at 21 October 2015 Supplementary Budget Estimates, no grants or projects have been approved under the Priority Industry Capability Development Fund.
- (b) Refer to Question on Notice 90 from 21 October 2015 Supplementary Budget Estimates.
- (c) Government is currently considering the recommendations of the report.
- (d) No.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Tactical Communications Network – JP 2072 Phase 3

Question reference number: 75

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Regarding JP2072, Tactical Communications Network (TCN), and its procurement process:

- (1) Can Defence confirm how many bids it received to do this work?
- (2) Which companies bid for this work?
- (3) What process did the procurement take – was it an open tender, limited tender, or some other procurement process?
- (4) How much money did Defence spend on the tender process?
- (5) Can the Department name the successful companies in JP 2072 Phase 2?
- (6) Can the Department confirm that the incumbents of 2072 Phase 2 were aware that they were the sole bidder for this Phase of the programme, prior to their tender submission?
- (7) The global TCN market is highly competitive, with a range of suppliers from the United States and Europe (including BAE Systems, General Dynamics, Northrup Grumman, Rockwell Collins, Selex & Thales) all of whom offer mature, battle-proven products and systems. Why did none of these global companies respond to the JP 2072- Phase 3 tender?
- (8) Were there any changes to the original tender request?
 - (a) Was the tender designed to maximise competition by encouraging off-the-shelf existing solutions and products to be offered?
- (9) Does the Department believe that the solution offered by the single bid is a value-for-money proposal?
 - (a) What is Defence's response to suggestions that the solution offered is twice the available budget and due to the single-source position enjoyed by the bidder will involve a transfer of delivery risk back onto the Department?
- (10) Can the Department confirm that in September 2014 the acquisition strategy was changed to request a complex, bespoke, top-down solution?
- (11) Does Defence agree with the suggestion that this changed acquisition strategy may have had the following effects:
 - (a) favouring the incumbent by requiring legacy system integration;
 - (b) increasing the bidding and development costs for industry;
 - (c) specifying requirements that favoured incumbent products;

- (d) allowing Army's mandated provider of data services to join a single team, which created an un-level playing field (due to higher integration risk) for potential competitors; and/or
 - (e) increasing programme failure risk, by failing to learn delivery lessons from UK/Europe?
- (12) Does this changed acquisition strategy explain why a range of industry competitors withdrew from the competition? If not, what accounts for their withdrawal?
- (13) Is it reasonable to conclude that by failing to achieve any competition in the tender for JP 2072 Phase 3, Army will:
- (a) be forced to take a proprietary solution that will lock Army into a single supplier for 10+ years;
 - (b) be unable to maintain competitive tension and value-for-money; and
 - (c) be unable to take advantage of developments in this area in other countries?
- (14) A number of expert studies, such as those undertaken by RAND, assert that the key lesson learnt from the US experience of introducing 'Battlefield Digitisation' is to use a 'Spiral Development' approach to de-risk the program and to encourage sustained competition. Is it not now the case that Army – by using incremental technology insertion and a published, open architecture – could:
- (a) significantly lower acquisition and support costs;
 - (b) rapidly insert key technology that make a difference;
 - (c) significantly reduce operational disruption in the introduction of new systems/training; and
 - (d) retain competitive pressure on product/technology suppliers over time?

Answer:

- (1) One.
 - (2) Harris Communications Australia, teaming with Boeing Defence Australia and Elbit Systems Australia.
 - (3) Open tender.
 - (4) Defence spent approximately \$2.3 million.
 - (5) The successful company for Phase 2A was Harris Corporation, and Phase 2B was Boeing Defence Australia.
 - (6) No. Defence Requests for Tender prohibit collusion between tendering companies.
 - (7) It is industry's decision to participate (or not to participate) in any tender process.
 - (8) Yes. There were six amendments, which included two extensions to the Request for Tender close date. There were no material changes to the Function and Performance Specification. All amendments were published on the AUSTENDER website.
- (a) Yes, it was an open tender.

- (9) The tendered offer is under evaluation.
 - (a) The tendered offer is under evaluation.
- (10) The acquisition strategy was always open tender. The Function and Performance Specification was developed to meet Army's capability requirements.
- (11) (a-e) The acquisition strategy is aligned with Army's requirements including a requirement for integration with the JP 2072 Tranche 1 system (which remains in service). The requirements were expressly designed not to favour any particular providers.
- (12) It is industry's decision to participate (or not to participate) in any tender process.
- (13) (a-c) No, Phase 3 was an open tender.
- (14) (a-d) JP 2072 is using a 'spiral development' approach to de-risk the program and allow incremental development of technology and capability implementation. Phase 3 has used lessons learnt not only from overseas but also from Tranche 1 of JP 2072 and the extensive risk reduction activities that have been conducted.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Workforce – Engineering, Science and Technical Skills

Question reference number: 76

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) Is the Department aware of the campaign being pursued by Professionals Australia entitled: 'Securing Defence Capability, fixing the engineering, science and technical skills crisis in Defence'?
- (b) In the Department's submission of 26 October 2015 to the Senate inquiry into the Defence Physical, Science and Engineering workforce, it was asserted that 'Defence's physical science and engineering (PSE) workforce is capable, meets the Government's requirements and is well placed to meet future challenges.' However, the ASPI report undertaken by Dr Martin Callinan and Mr Alan Gray asserted that there were significant emerging science and technology fields that Defence had skill shortages, in terms of current and future workforce – including Information Technology, technical disciplines to support autonomous systems, modelling and simulation, and material science and engineering. Further, Dr Callinan and Mr Gray contended that Defence's current labour force arrangements were too ad hoc, focussed on short-term service delivery and were not set against long term strategic objectives. How does Defence reconcile these competing perspectives?
- (c) Has the Department undertaken any work to support a human resource model that encourages mobility among the defence research and broader Australian PSE community?
- (d) How does the Department intend to meet the challenges associated with anticipated retirements of a key cohort of PSE workforce over the next 5-10 years?
- (e) Has there been any effort regarding better managing transfer arrangements and security clearances for those working on Defence projects? If so, please detail what has been done to date.
- (f) The First Principles Review recommended stronger workforce planning. What has the Department done to implement this recommendation?
- (g) Professionals Australia has called on the Government to take six actions to deal with what it describes as a 'technical skills crisis in Defence', in six-point-plan which can be found at:
<http://www.professionalsaustralia.org.au/wp->

content/uploads/2015/08/PA_Securing_Defence.pdf What is the Defence's response to Professional Australia's six-point-plan?

Answer:

(a) Yes.

(b)(f)(g) The Department of Defence remains well placed to meet future challenges. Work has already commenced on the Defence Strategic Workforce Plan which is due for completion in the second half of 2016. This plan will examine areas of workforce risk and identify mitigating strategies. This will be informed by an APS critical occupations review and an APS skills census.

In addition, there will be more detailed workforce plans for the various job families including Engineering and Technical; Science and Technology; and Information Communication Technology. These workforce plans will also consider areas of emerging demand as identified in the Defence White Paper such as driving recruitment, learning and development, and providing career and skilling pathways. Workforce plans will also consider the Professional Australia six-point plan, and where appropriate, integrate actions with other initiatives already being developed.

- (c) Defence encourages mobility between the Defence research and broader Australian physical sciences and engineering community; this includes industry and academia placements, Internships, visiting fellowships and sabbaticals. The Defence Strategic Workforce Plan will examine other potential initiatives.
- (d) The ageing population is a common challenge to the Australian economy, and Defence is taking positive steps to attract and retain employees with specialist skills, including through enhanced remuneration, flexible work practices, increased graduate intakes, the introduction of clear career pathways, formal education programs for current employees, knowledge transfer including through transition to retirement programs, mentoring programs, and improved collaboration with national and international partners.
- (e) Defence has not identified any problems with the ability to transfer staff between projects. Security clearances are transferable across Defence projects and Australian Government agencies for the life of the security clearance.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence Science and Technology Group – Staffing and Capabilities

Question reference number: 77

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) Can Defence provide a summary of recent cuts to the civilian defence technical workforce? Please include details related to APS levels, years of experience and qualifications (particularly PhDs).
- (b) Can Defence please provide detail on what further cuts are planned? Some media reports suggest it could be thousands. Are these cuts primarily as a result of the abolition of DMO or the redesignation of DSTO to DSTG?
- (c) The First Principles Review found that it could not discern a clear articulation of the value of DSTO's contribution to defence outcomes: Whilst we acknowledge that good work is being undertaken by the Defence Science and Technology Organisation, it struggled to articulate clearly to the review team the value that it contributes to Defence outcomes. We recommend (2.16) that the Defence Science and Technology Organisation be required to clearly articulate its value proposition. This would include examples and actual amounts of value created. (– page 41.) It was understood that DSTO was required to undertake supplementary work to elucidate this aspect. Was this work completed and what were the outcomes?
- (d) The First Principles Review also recommended that DSTO be moved into Defence: Recommendation 2.17: The Defence Science and Technology Organisation become part of the Capability Acquisition and Sustainment Group. Has this recommendation now been given effect, as could be indicated by the name change to DSTG?
 - (i) If so, what has changed given the Government initially elected not to adopt this recommendation and why was there no announcement?
- (e) Given DSTO/DSTG had major staffing cuts, budgets cuts and has been downgraded from an organisation to a group, how has its mission changed?
 - (i) What services and functions is DSTO/DSTG no longer performing?
- (f) With the Future Submarine decision imminent, what role has DSTG played and what role is envisaged, if any, for DSTG to perform?

- (g) What submarine technology expertise does DSTG still retain and how will it be deployed?
- (h) At Senate Estimates in October 2015, DSTG noted that in response to the First Principles Review it had engaged a consultant to review the value of DSTO.
 - (i) What is the name of this report, who was the author, and how much did the report cost?
 - (ii) At Senate Estimates in October 2015, DSTG asserted that the report found that 'their effort was worth billions'. Can Defence please provide further detail as to what was assessed to be the value of DSTG and how this was calculated?
 - (iii) Can Defence please provide a copy of the report?

Answer:

- (a) Defence's APS workforce is being reshaped in accordance with the First Principles Review and the capability priorities outlined in the 2016 Defence White Paper.

Defence has always and continues to employ a comprehensive, effective and highly skilled Physical Science and Engineering workforce. Defence is increasing its expertise and retaining experience in capabilities which the Department has prioritised.

The APS Physical Science and Engineering workforce has gone from 10,559 in 2013 to 9,647 as at 1 December 2015. Retention rates have been in line with the wider APS, and slightly higher than the Defence APS average.

The reductions in the Defence PSE workforce have generally been in line with those of the rest of the Department.

The variation in Physical Science and Engineering numbers has not compromised Defence's ability to meet capability and Government's requirements.

While Defence has seen the exiting of some employees with specific expertise and qualifications, we have steps in place to retain and share their knowledge through the introduction of the DSTG Building Defence Capability Payment (BCDP) Transition to Retirement Program. This scheme enables DSTG to capture specialist knowledge from some of its most highly skilled and experienced Science and Technology staff members prior to retirement. In return, DSTG will provide a financial incentive in exchange for the knowledge transfer.

The Scheme ensures: that DSTG effectively manages workforce planning associated with retirement of employees; knowledge transfer occurs to continue delivering Science and Technology capability; and that opportunities to assess and realign the Science and Technology workforce is provided to build long-term Science and Technology capability.

- (b) As advised in the 2016 Defence White Paper, Defence's civilian workforce will stabilise at around 18,200 Full Time Equivalent (FTE). In line with the First Principles Review, Defence is currently developing a Strategic

Workforce Plan that will provide guidance on the nature of its civilian workforce, including its capability and skills mix. Until this work is further advanced, it is not possible to provide advice on the future size of any specific segment of the workforce.

- (c) Please refer to Question on Notice No. 88 from Additional Budget Estimates 10 February 2016.
- (d) Recommendation 2.17 has not been accepted by Government. The Defence Science and Technology Organisation was renamed the Defence Science and Technology Group (DST Group) to align with the One Defence business model recommended in the First Principles Review. While the Defence Science and Technology Organisation has always been a 'group' within the Defence structure, this is now explicitly acknowledged in the name.
- (e) and (e)(i) The mission of DST Group remains unchanged. DST Group continues to perform the functions and services required by prioritising its work program in consultation with other parts of Defence, taking into account both the short and long term needs of Defence and Government. In addition DST Group builds strategic partnerships with industry, academia and other government agencies and international government research organisations to provide additional sources of expertise to supplement that of DST Group.
- (f) DST Group has provided, and will continue to provide, advice on technical risk, support to risk mitigation activities and capability analysis studies.
- (g) DST Group retains expertise in submarine platform technologies, combat system technologies and capability analysis. This expertise is deployed consistent with Defence priorities to maintain current fleets and future capability.
- (h)(i) to (iii) The report is titled *Economic Impact Case Studies: Establishing the broad economic value of the Defence Science and Technology Program*. It was authored by ACIL Allen Consulting under a contract valued at \$209,737 GST inclusive. The report can be accessed at:
<http://www.dsto.defence.gov.au/economic-impact-2015>.

The report provided supporting evidence of the value provided by the DST Group by assessing the economic benefit of 10 case studies over the period 2003-2015. The study focused on economic benefits flowing to Australia in terms of cost savings (efficiency), capability enhancements (effectiveness) and Australian export sales. The report assessed the tangible economic benefits of the research associated with the 10 case studies as being approximately \$5.1b. The report also stated "it may be reasonable to conclude that the extension of the case study approach across all DST Group projects would yield about 4 to 5 times the value (\$20-25 billion)".

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Contamination – Defence Report

Question reference number: 78

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

With regard to the following at Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016:

Senator PAYNE: I said I would come back as soon as I possibly could, Senator. As I said to you, the report was tabled on Thursday. Today is Wednesday, and I will respond to the Senate committee with advice from Defence as soon as possible.

- (a) Has Defence provided advice to the Minister regarding the Senate Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade References Committee report into the contamination at Williamstown?
- (b) When was this advice provided?
- (c) Has this advice been provided to new Assistant Defence Minister, Michael McCormack?

Answer:

- (a) Yes.
- (b) Defence provided initial advice to the Minister on 29 February 2016 and continued to provide supplementary advice in response to requests from the Minister. This included advice that on 16 March 2016 the Australian Health Protection Principal Committee and its sub-committee, the Environmental Health Standing Committee, released a fact sheet and guidance statements respectively on perflourinated chemicals.
- (c) Yes.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Contamination – Bores and Swimming Pools

Question reference number: 79

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

With regard to the following at Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016:

***Mr Grzeskowiak:** That has been our first priority, and so we have sampled a lot of people's bores, a lot of swimming pools and a lot of rainwater tanks—204 bores, 150 rainwater tanks and 20 swimming pools. We do not have all of the results back yet, but here are the results so far: 139 nil detects—that means no PFOS or PFOA detected—and 27 detects.*

- (a) Can Defence provide an update on how many bores, swimming pools and rainwater tanks it plans to assess in total?
- (b) How many have been assessed to date?
- (c) What are the results of those that have been assessed?

Answer:

(a) to (c) Due to the ongoing nature of the environmental investigation it is difficult to define how many bores, swimming pools, and rainwater tanks will be assessed.

As at 26 February 2016, Defence has tested the following private bores, swimming pools, and rainwater tanks near the Army Aviation Centre Oakey and near RAAF Base Williamtown. Those where perfluorooctane sulfonate and/or perfluorooctanoic acid have been detected above the screening criteria are also listed.

Oakey

Total Bore tests = 99

Total Bore detects = 33

Total Swimming pool tests = 9

Total Swimming pool detects = 7

Total Rainwater tank tests = 27

Total Rainwater tank detects = 7

Williamtown

Total Bore tests = 210

Total Bore detects = 30

Total Swimming pool tests = 22

Total Swimming pool detects = 2

Total Rainwater tank tests = 159

Total Rainwater tank detects = 2

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Contamination – Compensation and Blood Testing

Question reference number: 80

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

During the 22 December 2015 Senate Committee inquiry hearing in Newcastle, Deputy Secretary Estate and Infrastructure, Mr Steve Grzeskowiak said: *“Certainly if there was to be something like a compensation scheme established that would be a decision for government.”*

- (a) Has Defence provided advice to Government about compensation for residents?
 - (i) What format was this advice provided?
 - (ii) Who provided this advice?
 - (iii) When was this advice provided?
- (b) Has Defence provided advice to Government about voluntary acquisition of homes?
 - (i) If so, who provided this advice?
 - (ii) When was this advice provided?
- (c) Has Defence provided advice to Government about voluntary blood testing for residents?
 - (i) If so, who provided this advice?
 - (ii) When was this advice provided?

Answer:

(a) and (b) Defence provided initial advice on these topics to the Minister for Defence in February 2016 to assist in the Government’s consideration of the recommendations of the Senate Inquiry. Further advice was also provided in September 2016. Advice continues to be provided given the complex nature of these matters.

(c) Yes. On 16 August 2016, the Government agreed to commission an epidemiological study and to establish a voluntary blood testing program for people who have lived or worked in the Williamstown and Oakey investigation areas. With the consent from individuals, results from the testing will be used as part of the epidemiological study.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates - 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Contamination – Community Meetings

Question reference number: 81

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question: With regard to the following at Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016:

Mr Grzeskowiak: We are as engaged as we can be with the local community and we are always trying to be more engaged. We have attended every meeting of the community reference group, which is a roughly weekly meeting, since back in September last year.

- (a) How many community reference group meetings has Defence attended since September 2015?
- (b) Who has been involved in these community consultations?
- (c) How many community members attended these meetings?
- (d) Has Defence received feedback about these meetings?
 - (i) What format has this feedback been submitted?
 - (ii) Has this feedback been passed onto the Minister or Assistant Minister?
- (e) How long does Defence plan to continue to attend these community meetings?

Answer:

- (a) Defence has attended all 13 Community Reference Group meetings since September 2015. In addition to the formal meetings, Defence has participated in community information sessions organised on behalf of the Community Reference Group.
- (b) The following Defence representatives have attended Community Reference Group meetings:
 - The Hon Darren Chester MP, former Assistant Minister for Defence and support staff;
 - The Hon Michael McCormack MP, Assistant Minister for Defence and support staff;
 - Mr Steve Grzeskowiak, Department of Defence;
 - Air Vice Marshal Greg Evans, Department of Defence;
 - Ms Alison Clifton, Department of Defence;

- Brigadier Mark Holmes, Department of Defence;
 - Brigadier Noel Beutel, Department of Defence;
 - Air Commodore Steve Roberton, Department of Defence;
 - Air Commodore Craig Heap, Department of Defence;
 - Ms Stacey Hannon, Department of Defence;
 - Mr James McLachlan, Department of Defence;
 - Ms Vicki Pearce, Department of Defence;
 - Mr Michael Lysewycz, Department of Defence;
 - Mr David Rawlins, Department of Defence (observer);
 - Ms Sarah Davis, Department of Defence (observer);
 - Ms Amanda Cornell, Department of Defence (observer);
 - Ms Mary-Anne Mellor, Department of Defence (observer);
 - Mr Mark Donaghey, Department of Defence (observer);
 - Wing Commander Peter Cluff, Department of Defence (observer);
 - Mr Steve Peios, Department of Defence (observer);
 - Ms Adeline Cheah, Department of Defence (observer); and
 - Ms Melita Parker, Department of Defence (observer).
- (c) The meetings are not open to the general public. There are 10 community representatives on the Community Reference Group.
- (d) Following each meeting minutes and action items are circulated for attendees' consideration before finalisation at the next meeting. Defence provides advice to the Minister for Defence and Assistant Minister for Defence as part of broader advice on the matter of the environmental investigations on and near RAAF Base Williamtown.
- (e) Defence plans to continue attending the Community Reference Group and its associated community information sessions.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Contamination – Exposure Evaluation Scheme

Question reference number: 82

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

In answer to Question on Notice 96 (3) (e) at Supplementary Estimates on 21 October 2015, Defence said that: *“As a result of the above, Defence is not planning to contact members who have now left the ADF who may have been exposed to the contaminants – including families of children who previously attended the on-base child care centre at RAAF Base Williamtown”*.

At Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016, Mr Grzeskowiak said: Mr

Grzeskowiak: We are briefing staff through our base management teams to try and explain to them this issue. We are explaining to them that there is an incredibly low risk of any exposure to people, particularly on the base. The base runs off town water, which we know is not contaminated. There is a scheme in Defence, an exposure evaluation scheme. People can register with that scheme if they have a concern and then they can have a chat with the doctor. So all those mechanisms are in place and in play at the moment.

- (a) How many people have registered with the exposure evaluation scheme as a result of the PFOA and PFOS exposure?
- (b) What means does Defence use to ensure current serving ADF members and veterans are aware of the existence of the exposure evaluation scheme?

Answer:

- (a) None.
- (b) Any registration via the Scheme is voluntary. Defence provides information on the Scheme via dedicated internal and external websites. It also publicises a 1800 number on the websites through which information can be sourced. Additionally, Defence runs articles in the Service Newspapers during the year.

Defence also provides information on the Scheme to the Department of Veterans' Affairs and Ex-Service Organisations so that the information can be made available to ex-serving members through their information sources.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence Abuse Response Taskforce

Question reference number: 83

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) It has been reported that the Defence Abuse Response Taskforce (the Taskforce) will cease operations on 31 March 2016, and that taskforce funded counselling will no longer be available after 30 June 2016 (and that all approved sessions must be held by that date).
 - (i) What are the specific options for counselling, and its funding, that will be available to victims of sexual abuse in the ADF after this date?
 - (ii) What options are available after 31 March 2016 for those who have been victims of sexual abuse in the ADF, who had not yet contacted the Taskforce, to obtain counselling and funding support?
- (b) With regard to the Restorative Engagement Program, the current terms of reference for the taskforce require it to “conclude as far as possible outstanding restorative engagement conferences by 31 March 2016”.
 - (i) At this stage does the Taskforce expect to have concluded all outstanding restorative engagement conferences by that date?
 - (ii) What options exist for any conferences that have not been concluded by 31 March?

Answer:

- (a)(i)(ii) The DART was established in 2012 as a short term mechanism in response to the DLA Piper Review - it was never intended to be a permanent body. The current Terms of Reference and funding for the DART will expire on 30 June 2016. The Government is considering appropriate arrangements for post-Taskforce completion. Current and former Australian Defence Force (ADF) members are able to access counselling from a range of services both internal and external to Defence. The services differ depending on the nature of the issue for which they are seeking support. Internal Defence services include the Sexual Misconduct Prevention and Response Office (SeMPRO), medical officers, psychologists and Chaplains. There are also a range of government services available if the member is eligible, or via a referral from a Defence Medical Officer, such as the Veterans and Veterans Families Counselling

Service. Former and current members may be eligible for assistance from the Department of Veterans' Affairs, including funding for ongoing counselling . ADF members can also access government and non-government sexual assault services for counselling, and victims of crime/victim support services for counselling, which are generally free of charge.

SeMPRO is a service that provides information and support to victims of sexual misconduct, including sexual assault. SeMPRO can be contacted by phone, email or text by both current and former ADF members seeking support or counselling. Further information on contacting SeMPRO can be found at the following link: <http://www.defence.gov.au/sempro/>.

SeMPRO support coordinators can assist by linking members with appropriate support or counselling options based on individual needs and eligibility for services both internal and external to Defence. SeMPRO provides advice on free services, and options for accessing funding for counselling by assessing the individual circumstances of current and former members who make contact.

- (b)(i) (ii) The Taskforce will complete its existing case load, including restorative engagement conferences by 30 June 2016, in line with its amended terms of reference.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Workforce – Civilian Redundancies

Question reference number: 84

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

At Supplementary Estimates on 21 October 2015, Secretary Richardson outlined how he saw the staffing trajectory *“We will have quite a number of voluntary redundancies that will kick in between now and say February or so of next year. At the same, in January and February of next year, we will have the graduate cadet and trainee intake and that will probably lead to around 250 to 270 people coming into the organisation. You put all of that together, and with our natural attrition rate, we will probably go below 17,900. When and how far, it is a bit early to tell.”*

- (a) What are the current expectations? With regard to the voluntary redundancies, a report in the Canberra Times on 2 February 2016 suggested the process was now complete, with 575 redundancies, and gave some numbers in different categories.
- (b) Are there plans to establish a further redundancy program?
- (c) Can Defence provide the numbers of voluntary redundancies accepted?
- (d) Can Defence categorise these voluntary redundancies by departmental group and by work category?

Answer:

(a) The 2015-16 Portfolio Additional Estimates Statements advised a revised estimate for the size of Defence's Australian Public Service workforce by the end of 2015-16 of approximately 17,500 Full Time Equivalent staff. This estimate is based on known patterns of recruitment and separations, including the Voluntary Retrenchment program, and remains current. Additionally, the recent release of the 2016 Defence White Paper states that the APS workforce will be rebalanced to provide for a future APS workforce of around 18,200 Full Time Equivalent.

(b) No.

(c) Defence expects to offer 575 voluntary redundancies under the program. As at 26 February 2016, 357 formal offers have been made. A total of 323 employees have accepted, with separation dates ranging between November 2015 and March 2016. A total of 14 offers have been formally declined and a further 20 offers await a decision from the employee (they have 14 days from the date of offer to accept or decline).

Remaining offers are being progressively made with the program to be fully completed by mid June 2016.

- (d) A voluntary redundancy will only be offered where Defence considers that it is consistent with organisational needs and requirements. Defence is focussed on ensuring its workforce is balanced to deliver capability. A summary of all voluntary redundancy offers to be made by Job Family (work category) and departmental Group is at Attachment A.

DEFENCE VR PROGRAM - VOLUNTARY REDUNDANCIES BY GROUP AND WORK CATEGORY

JOB FAMILY	AIR FORCE	ARMY	CAP DEV	CASG	CFO	CIO	DES	DPG	DSTG	EIG	INT	JOC	NAVY	STRAT	VCDF	Total
Admin & Corp Support	4	1	3	39		3	3	5	2	22	1	2			7	92
Asset Management			1	20												21
Auditing & Assurance				11		1	8			3					1	24
Comm & Stakeholder Mgmt	1			4						3					2	10
Customer Service										5						5
Engineering and Technical	4	3		45		1							4		3	60
Finance			2	2	45			1								50
Info & Knowledge Mgmt		1		4				1	1	2	1	1			2	13
Information Comms Technologies		1				37					2				3	43
Infrastructure									1	29						30
Intelligence and Security				2		1	4				10		1			18
Legal				3			2									5
Logistics	2			20											5	27
People	1	2		2				33		1					2	41
Procurement and Contracting				17		3		1		2					1	24
Project Management	1	2	3	46		1	1	1	2	1		1			2	61
Science and Technology									43							43
Strategic & International Pol			2				1		2					2		7
Health															1	1
Total	13	10	11	215	45	47	19	42	51	68	14	4	5	2	29	575

- Notes
1. Defence uses Job Family to describe work categories
 2. Group means the highest level organisational elements in Defence
 3. Acronyms
 - a. ARMY, NAVY and AIR FORCE are all considered Groups for the purposes of administration of APS employees under their control
 - b. CAP DEV - Capability Development Group. Under FPR this Group will be disbanded with functions transferring to the new Capability Acquisition and Strategic Policy and Intelligence Groups
 - c. CASG - Capability Acquisition and Sustainment Group. Formerly Defence Materiel Organisation (DMO)
 - d. CFO - Chief Finance Officer Group
 - e. CIO - Chief Information Officer Group
 - f. DES - Defence Executive Staff - organisational elements not attached to a Group. Organisationally they report to the Associate Secretary. Includes Audit and Fraud Control, Inspector General ADF, Offices of the Secretary and CDF, Defence Security and Defence Legal
 - g. DPG - Defence People Group
 - h. DSTG - Defence Science and Technology Group
 - i. EIG - Estate and Infrastructure Group
 - j. INT - Intelligence and Security Group. Under FPR, the intelligence function merges with Strategy Group to form the new Strategic Policy and Intelligence Group.
 - k. JOC - Joint Operations Command
 - l. STRAT - Strategy Group. Under FPR, merges with the Intelligence Group to form the new Strategic Policy and Intelligence Group.
 - m. VCDF - Vice Chief of Defence Force. Includes Health, Logistics and other joint force enablers.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimate – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Workforce – Graduate Recruitment and Retention

Question reference number: 85

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

The same media report [Canberra Times on 2 February 2016] says there have been 250 acceptances of offers of graduate recruitment.

(1) Please provide a breakdown of work categories of the graduate recruits?

The Department has a complex set of demands for skilled employees in a wide range of categories.

(2) Does Defence have a Workforce Strategy or strategic plan of some kind which can give senior decision makers a sense of how the workforce is tracking over the longer-term?

(3) How far ahead does the Department plan?

(4) How does the Department put such a plan together?

The ability to retain staff is clearly crucial, and retaining new recruits is an important part of this.

(5) As new recruits go, what were the drop-out rates amongst the graduate intake for 2013, 2014 and 2015

(6) What percentage of graduates separated from the Department at or before the end of their first year, and what percentage after one year and at or before the end of their second year?

(7) Please provide a breakdown by category of graduate?

(8) What are the reasons for early separation of graduates?

Answer:

(1) As at 2 February 2016, 250 offers to graduates had been accepted across the following work categories:

Graduate Offers accepted at 2 February 2016 by Category	Number
Intelligence Analyst	66
Engineering / Naval Architecture	50
Finance	9
Generalists	33
Human Resources	9

ICT (Inc. Cyber)	43
Infrastructure	10
Logistics	11
Procurement & Contracting	19
Total	250

- (2) The last Defence Strategic Workforce Plan was produced in 2010. Work has already commenced on the development of a new Strategic Workforce Plan, which will be completed in the second half of 2016. The Strategic Workforce Plan will be refreshed on an annual basis. The Strategic Workforce Plan will provide the direction for a variety of subordinate workforce plans for the Services, Groups and Australian Public Service Job Families.
- (3) Defence plans for capabilities (e.g. submarines) that will be in place for decades. However, plans such as the Defence Strategic Workforce Plan primarily consider requirements within the next 10 years, with a focus on actions for the next three to five years.
- (4) The ability to retain staff is clearly crucial, and retaining new recruits is an important part of this. The Department is developing workforce plans in accordance with the Australian Standard for Workforce Planning (AS 5620:2015). The Strategic Workforce Plan is based on an analysis of the environment in which Defence operates, and an analysis of gaps between current and future workforce demand and supply. This analysis provides the basis for workforce initiatives to attract, develop and retain the workforce that Defence requires.
- (5) Total drop out rate of graduates exiting the Department for intakes in calendar years 2013, 2014 and 2015.

Intakes by Calendar Year	Total graduates entering workforce	Total 'drop out' number as at 1 March 2016	Total 'drop out' rate as at 1 March 2016
2013 Intakes	179	43	24%
2014 Intakes	176	30	17%
2015 Intakes	179	4	2%
Total as at 1 March 2016	534	7	14%

(6) and (7) A breakdown of drop-out rates by category of graduate for intakes 2013,2014 and 2015 are as follows:

Graduate Category	Total graduates for calendar years 2013, 2014 & 2015	Total attrition number	Total attrition %	Left before end of 1st year	Left after 1st year, before 2nd year
Intelligence Analyst	136	12	9%	1%	3%
Engineering / Naval Architecture	78	10	13%	4%	8%
Finance	42	8	17%	0%	10%
Generalist	70	14	19%	1%	9%
Human Resources	10	3	30%	0%	0%
Information Technology (inc. Cyber)	107	11	10%	3%	4%
Infrastructure	12	2	17%	0%	17%
Logistics	17	1	6%	0%	6%
Procurement & Contracting	62	16	26%	5%	13%
Total	534	77	14%	2%	7%

- (8) Exit surveys for graduates departing the Department during their training program identify acceptance of an alternate offer of employment as the primary reason for early separation and in a minority of cases, reasons also include relocation back home to family networks. In two cases since 2013, early termination of employment has occurred due to graduates not meeting requirements of probation.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: First Principles Review - Contestability

Question reference number: 86

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (1) With regard to the statement made at Supplementary Estimates on 21 October 2015 by the Secretary, “Our biggest single challenge, in my view—we have several challenges—is the development of an effective capability development process which encompasses contestability. That is progressing. We are meant to have that in place by 1 February.”
 - (a) Is the process now in place?
 - (b) What is the nature of the program that has been developed?
 - (c) Has it been used or trialled on any particular projects or proposals?
 - (i) If so, which ones?
- (2) Is RAND still working with the Department on contestability models [as mentioned at Supplementary Estimates on 21 October 2015 by Deputy Secretary Strategy Mr Baxter] or has it completed its work?
 - (a) If the work is completed:
 - (i) What approach has Defence settled on?
 - (ii) What were RAND’s conclusions as to what constituted international best practice?

Answer:

- (1)(a) No. The design is nearing finalisation and the new process is planned to commence in April 2016.
- (1)(b) The Capability Life Cycle seeks to align strategy, capability and resources to provide options for Government on the design of future Defence capability. The design is focused on delivering an end-to-end process that delivers value for money through efficiently and effectively procuring, sustaining and disposing of Defence capabilities.
- (1)(c) There have been no trials as the process is yet to be finalised.

(2)(a)(i) RAND has provided Defence with an analysis of international contestability models. The report informs the ongoing detailed design of the Contestability function.

(2)(a)(ii) RAND's findings can be found on pages xxii and xxiii in the RAND report, titled "Contestability Frameworks: An International Horizon Scan", which can be found at www.rand.org.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: First Principles Review – CASG – Smart Buyer Model

Question reference number: 87

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

At Supplementary Estimates on 21 October 2015, the Secretary stated with regard to a voluntary redundancy process in CASG that CASG would be “*going through a process of some recruitment and refreshing over the next six months*”

- (a) How many voluntary redundancies have been accepted by former DMO officers and how many have separated so far as a result?
- (b) With regard to “recruitment and refreshing” - how many new staff have been recruited so far into CASG?
- (c) Has Defence completed the transfer of CASG finance functions to the Chief Finance Officer, and that of personnel and administrative functions to the Defence People Group?
- (d) Exactly which functions are involved; for example, is it limited to personnel and administrative budgets?
- (e) How far has work progressed on the establishment of the “smart buyer model”?
- (f) When does the Department expect CASG to be fully effective, that is, when would the transitional phase be completed?

Answer:

- (a) As at 26 February 2016, 115 former Defence Materiel Organisation employees have accepted voluntary redundancy offers with separation dates between November 2015 and March 2016.
- (b) In the period 21 October 2015 to 26 February 2016, a total of 89 new staff (82 ongoing and 7 non-ongoing) have been recruited into Capability Acquisition and Sustainment Group (CASG).
- (c) Defence has completed the transfer of CASG finance functions to the Chief Finance Officer, and the transfer of personnel and administrative functions to the Defence People Group.
- (d) Functions transferred include human resource and finance policy, workforce planning, human resource and financial administration/support functions.

- (e) The high level Smart Buyer concept was approved by the Secretary in December 2015 and it forms an integral part of the new Defence Capability Lifecycle. The intention is to complete initial design work on the 'Smart Buyer model' by the end of April 2016 and then, after a period of testing and piloting, to commence the roll-out of the model by the end of 2016.
- (f) In line with the First Principles Review, it is expected that transition will be completed by 30 June 2017.

Senate Standing Committees on Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: First Principles Review - Defence Science and Technology Group Business Model

Question reference number: 88

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Questions:

In answer to Question on Notice 15 from Supplementary Budget Estimates on 21 October 2015, Defence advised that “*Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu are assisting in the development of a new investment business model for Defence Science and Technology Group (DSTG), which will influence research prioritisation and that ACIL Allen Consulting undertaking an analysis of the economic benefit of the Defence Science and Technology Program to assist with the development of the DSTG value proposition*”.

- (a) What has Defence decided on with regard to the “appropriate investment business model for DSTG”?
- (b) How does this model influence research prioritisation?
- (c) What are the elements involved in assessing the “economic benefit” of the Defence Science and Technology Program?
- (d) On what basis was “economic benefit” assessed?
 - (i) Economic benefit to whom: Australia as a whole, Australian defence industry, the Government as a holder of intellectual property rights, or something else?
- (e) Please explain what the “DSTG value proposition” is?
 - (i) Is the information in the value proposition being used for consideration of privatisation or outsourcing of DSTG?

Answers:

- (a) Defence is still developing a new investment model for the Defence Science and Technology Group (DSTG).
- (b) The purpose of the model is to determine research priorities in alignment with future force requirements and decisions about the allocation of resources and effort within the Group.
- (c)&(d) There are many ways to assess the economic benefits provided by an organisation. DSTG contracted ACIL Allen Consulting to undertake an independent study of the economic value of the Science and Technology Program since 2003. This report, *Economic Impact Case Studies*, assessed the economic benefit of 10 case studies over the period 2003-2015. The study focused on economic on benefits flowing to Australia in terms of cost savings (efficiency), capability enhancements (effectiveness) and Australian export sales.

The report assessed the tangible economic benefits of the research associated with the case studies as being approximately \$5.1 billion. These economic benefits flow beyond Defence to Australian Defence industry and Australia as a whole. The report can be accessed at:

<http://www.dsto.defence.gov.au/economic-impact-2015>.

- (e) The DSTG value proposition articulates the value provided by the Group to Defence outcomes through its capacity to reduce and mitigate strategic and operational risks and to create and maintain a capability edge. This value is demonstrated with examples at both the strategic and operational level. The DSTG Value Proposition can be accessed at:
<http://www.dsto.defence.gov.au/discover-dsto/our-value-proposition>.

Together, these documents establish a clear statement of the critical value Defence Science and Technology Group provides to Defence through its science and technology program.

- (i) This information is not being used for consideration of privatisation or outsourcing of DSTG.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: First Principles Review – Progress Report

Question reference number: 89

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (1) Has the date been set for the Minister for Defence to report progress to Government in March this year, as set out in Recommendation 6.4 of the First Principles Review?
- (2) What form will the report take?
- (3) Will there be a report to the Parliament?
- (4) Will there be any form of publicly available information on the progress achieved as of March 2016?

Answer:

- (1) The Government has agreed the annual progress updates on implementation of the First Principles Review will occur in July 2016 and July 2017. These dates align with the actual commencement date of implementation which began on 1 July 2015, following a three month period of detailed planning.
- (2) The progress updates will be provided to the National Security Committee of Cabinet in the form of a report with input from the Department and the Oversight Board, in accordance with Recommendation 6.4.
- (3) and (4) Decisions on subsequent reports to the Parliament and/or the public are yet to be finalised.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Voluntary Redundancies

Question reference number: 90

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question: The Canberra Times report by Philip Thompson of 8 February 2016 entitled ‘Defence Department staff fill unwanted jobs to secure redundancy payouts’ states *“Documents show Defence has allowed staff to put their hands up for jobs which have sat vacant and were soon to be abolished so they could score lucrative retrenchment pay-outs.”* and *“Documents show the department’s fraud control and investigations branch believed the deals were being done in good faith, were in line with Australian tax law and consistent with Defence’s voluntary redundancy program.”*

- (a) Were staff appointed to positions that were subsequently abolished, allowing them to receive redundancy payments?
- (b) If so, how many such cases were there?
- (c) Can Defence confirm that the Fraud Control and Investigations Branch examined cases of this kind?
- (d) If so, how many cases did it investigate?
- (e) Why did it conduct the investigation?
- (f) What are the details of these investigations?
- (g) The Fraud Control and Investigations Branch is reported to have said that the “deals” were done in good faith: Does Defence agree that being “done in good faith” is not the same as being done in the most administratively efficient and cost effective way?
- (h) Does Defence agree that it would have made more sense for the Department to abolish the vacant positions rather than wait for them to be filled and then abolished?
- (i) Was either the Secretary or the Associate Secretary aware of these deals? If not, should at least one of them have been made aware?

Answer:

(a) to (i) The 2015-16 Voluntary Redundancy program for Senior Executive Service and Executive Level employees was driven by the need to reshape Defence's middle management levels.

The Voluntary Redundancy program was conducted in good faith and in line with Australian Taxation Law.

The decision regarding the offer of a voluntary redundancy was based on the role needing to be changed or no longer required to meet organisational requirements from Defence's reform work, specifically the First Principles Review.

The Fraud Control and Investigation Branch examined one allegation related to an employee who took a voluntary redundancy, and found no issue of concern with respect to this case or the Voluntary Redundancy program.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Taxi Costs

Question reference number: 91

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) How much did each department/agency spend on taxis during the specified period? Provide a breakdown for each business group in each department/agency.
- (b) What are the reasons for taxi costs?
- (c) How much did the department spend on taxis during the specified period for their minister or minister's office?

Answer:

- (a) As reflected by Defence's financial management systems, Defence has spent \$4,398,126.85 on taxis in the period 14 September 2015 to 31 January 2016. A breakdown by Group is provided below.

GROUP	TOTAL
ARMY	\$1,357,031.57
AIR FORCE	\$694,924.65
NAVY	\$671,178.55
CAPABILITY ACQUISITION & SUSTAINMENT GROUP	\$534,704.66
DEFENCE SCIENCE TECHNOLOGY GROUP	\$297,081.00
VICE CHIEF DEFENCE FORCE	\$202,282.60
DEFENCE PEOPLE GROUP	\$135,401.42
ESTATE AND INFRASTRUCTURE GROUP	\$120,197.73
JOINT OPERATIONS COMMAND	\$89,454.59
DEFENCE EXECUTIVE SUPPORT	\$70,518.37
INTELLIGENCE & SECURITY	\$70,225.02
CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER GROUP	\$44,309.24
CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT	\$37,845.02
CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER	\$37,690.18
STRATEGY GROUP	\$35,282.25
GRAND TOTAL	\$4,398,126.85

- (b) Taxis are utilised by Defence for operational, business, training, removal and condition of service leave associated travel.

(c) A total of \$400.49 was spent by the Ministers Office during the relevant period.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates - 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Hospitality and Entertainment

Question reference number: 92

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) What has been the Department/Agency's hospitality spend including any catering and drinks costs.
- (b) For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, please detail total hospitality spend. Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs.
- (c) What has been the Department/Agency's entertainment spend? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs.
- (d) For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, please detail total entertainment spend. Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs.
- (e) What hospitality spend is the Department/Agency's planning on spending? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs.
- (f) For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, what hospitality spend is currently being planned for? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs.
- (g) What entertainment spend is the Department/Agency's planning on spending? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs.
- (h) For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, what entertainment spend is currently being planned for? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs.
- (i) Is the Department/Agency planning on reducing any of its spending on these items? If so, how will reductions be achieved?

Answer:

- (a) As reflected in Defence's financial management information systems, the total expenditure for the Defence Portfolio for hospitality was \$581,638 for the period 14 September 2015 to 31 January 2016.
- (b) As reflected in Defence's financial management information systems, the total expenditure for the Ministerial offices was \$15,758. Details are at Table 1.
- (c) and (g) Defence does not separate entertainment from hospitality.
- (d) There has been no expenditure on entertainment for the Ministerial offices for this period.
- (e) As reflected in Defence's financial management information systems, Defence has budgeted to spend \$2,123,812 on hospitality for financial year 2015-16.
- (f) and (h) Defence has not been advised of any anticipated hospitality or entertainment expenditure for the Ministerial offices.
- (i) The Department's planning and budgetary processes ensure that expenditure on these items is reasonable for Defence purposes in accordance with the Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act 2013 (PGPA Act 2013).

Minister and Parliamentary Secretary Office

Date	Minister	Location	Purpose	Catering Cost	Drinks Cost	Total Cost
13/10/2015	Assistant Minister for Defence (Minister Darren Chester)	Parliament House	Young Endeavour Youth Scheme - YEYS Briefing on activities & promotion to members	\$240.51	\$654.54	\$895.05
16/09/2015	Minister for Defence (Minister Kevin Andrews)	Parliament House	Defence Media and Committee Function hosted by Kevin Andrews	\$151.20	\$512.99	\$664.19
12/11/2015	Minister for Defence (Minister Marise Payne)	Parliament House	Foreign Defence Attache Function	\$5,821.05	\$442.09	\$6,263.14
25/11/2015	Minister for Defence (Minister Marise Payne)	Parliament House	Business Woman of the Year	\$1,467.14	\$0.00	\$1,467.14
25/11/2015	Minister for Defence (Minister Marise Payne)	Parliament House	34SQN Thank you function	\$6,230.25	\$238.08	\$6,468.33
				\$13,910.15	\$1,847.70	\$15,757.85

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Executive Coaching and Leadership Training

Question reference number: 93

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: Please provide the following information in relation to executive coaching and/or other leadership training services purchased by each department/agency:

1. Total spending on these services
2. The number of employees offered these services and their employment classification
3. The number of employees who have utilised these services, their employment classification and how much study leave each employee was granted (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)
4. The names of all service providers engaged
5. For each service purchased from a provider listed under (4), please provide:
 - a) The name and nature of the service purchased
 - b) Whether the service is one-on-one or group based
 - c) The number of employees who received the service and their employment classification
 - d) The total number of hours involved for all employees (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)
 - e) The total amount spent on the service
 - f) A description of the fees charged (i.e. per hour, complete package)
6. Where a service was provided at any location other than the department or agency's own premises, please provide:
 - a) The location used
 - b) The number of employees who took part on each occasion (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)
 - c) The total number of hours involved for all employees who took part (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)
 - d) Any costs the department or agency's incurred to use the location
7. In relation to education/executive coaching and/or other leadership training services paid for by the department what agreements are made with employees in regards to continuing employment after training has been completed?
8. For graduate or post graduate study, please breakdown each approved study leave by staffing allocation and degree or program title.

Answer:

Please refer to Question on Notice No. 88 from Additional Estimates of 26 February 2014. This response remains extant.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Staff - Staffing Profile

Question reference number: 94

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question: Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) Has there been any change to the staffing profile of the department/agency?
- (b) Provide a list of changes to staffing numbers, broken down by classification level, division, home base location (including town/city and state)

Answer:

- (a) and (b) The table below provides a breakdown of Defence's Australian Public Service (APS) workforce as at 14 September 2015 compared to the workforce as at 31 January 2016 by Group, APS classification and location by state and territory. Changes in staffing profile are also displayed.

The figures in the table are based on headcount data, rather than full time equivalents (FTE). Defence budgets for its APS workforce on a FTE (i.e. paid) basis. Headcount data counts all personnel equally regardless of the number of hours worked, and includes all personnel recorded as on duty, or on leave with or without pay.

State/Territory by Group/Services		14 September 2015				31 January 2016				Changes
		APS 1-6	Senior Officers	Senior Executives	Total	APS 1-6	Senior Officers	Senior Executives	Total	
ACT	Air Force	57	21		78	57	21		78	0
	Army	155	33		188	155	28		183	-5
	Capability Acq & Sustain Gp	705	649	24	1,378	659	557	22	1,238	-140
	Capability Development	61	78	4	143	56	68	4	128	-15
	Chief Finance Officer	343	211	13	567	330	182	11	523	-44
	Chief Information Officer	341	321	10	672	334	290	10	634	-38
	Def Science & Technology Gp	27	112	5	144	40	118	6	164	20
	Defence Executive Support	268	188	12	468	272	176	11	459	-9
	Defence People Group	623	247	7	877	556	226	5	787	-90
	Estate & Infrastructure Group	511	265	10	786	513	247	7	767	-19
	Joint Operations Command	8	6		14	7	4		11	-3
	Navy	134	68		202	131	66		197	-5
	Strategy Policy & Intelligence	1,373	750	32	2,155	1,354	749	31	2,134	-21
	VCDF	210	168	2	380	214	161	2	377	-3
ACT Total		4,816	3,117	119	8,052	4,678	2,893	109	7,680	-372
NSW	Air Force	158	36		194	160	36		196	2
	Army	210	6		216	211	6		217	1
	Capability Acq & Sustain Gp	831	198		1,029	810	186		996	-33
	Chief Finance Officer	218	29		247	214	27		241	-6
	Chief Information Officer	29	5		34	31	5		36	2
	Def Science & Technology Gp	31	51		82	29	48		77	-5
	Defence Executive Support	34	2		36	34	2		36	0
	Defence People Group	198	11		209	194	9		203	-6
	Estate & Infrastructure Group	393	42		435	371	37		408	-27
	Joint Operations Command	21	12		33	22	11		33	0
	Navy	280	43		323	274	44		318	-5
	Strategy Policy & Intelligence	3	1		4	4	4		8	4
	VCDF	300	47	1	348	300	42	1	343	-5
NSW Total		2,706	483	1	3,190	2,654	457	1	3,112	-78
NT	Air Force	16	1		17	16	1		17	0
	Army	18	1		19	17	1		18	-1

State/Territory by Group/Services		14 September 2015				31 January 2016				Changes
		APS 1-6	Senior Officers	Senior Executives	Total	APS 1-6	Senior Officers	Senior Executives	Total	
	Capability Acq & Sustain Gp	17	4		21	18	4		22	1
	Chief Finance Officer	15			15	15			15	0
	Chief Information Officer	8	1		9	8	1		9	0
	Def Science & Technology Gp		2		2		2		2	0
	Defence Executive Support	8			8	8			8	0
	Defence People Group	16	1		17	15	1		16	-1
	Estate & Infrastructure Group	63	4		67	61	3		64	-3
	Joint Operations Command	6			6	7			7	1
	Navy	15			15	13			13	-2
	Strategy Policy & Intelligence	27	14	2	43	29	16	2	47	4
	VCDF	41	1		42	40	1		41	-1
NT Total		250	29	2	281	247	30	2	279	-2
QLD	Air Force	75	7		82	74	7		81	-1
	Army	189	9		198	189	8		197	-1
	Capability Acq & Sustain Gp	215	64		279	201	56		257	-22
	Chief Finance Officer	78	8		86	82	6		88	2
	Chief Information Officer	25	3		28	25	3		28	0
	Def Science & Technology Gp	6	15		21	7	15		22	1
	Defence Executive Support	69	5		74	67	5		72	-2
	Defence People Group	74	6		80	71	5		76	-4
	Estate & Infrastructure Group	230	27		257	229	26		255	-2
	Joint Operations Command	2			2	2			2	0
	Navy	21	1		22	21	1		22	0
	Strategy Policy & Intelligence					1	2		3	3
	VCDF	237	16	1	254	239	16	1	256	2
QLD Total		1,221	161	1	1,383	1,208	150	1	1,359	-24
SA	Air Force	140	22		162	141	22		163	1
	Army	33			33	32			32	-1
	Capability Acq & Sustain Gp	162	85		247	154	81		235	-12
	Chief Finance Officer	100	6		106	81	4		85	-21
	Chief Information Officer	10	1		11	11	1		12	1

State/Territory by Group/Services		14 September 2015				31 January 2016				Changes
		APS 1-6	Senior Officers	Senior Executives	Total	APS 1-6	Senior Officers	Senior Executives	Total	
	Def Science & Technology Gp	622	682	3	1,307	657	658	4	1,319	12
	Defence Executive Support	69	2		71	66	1		67	-4
	Defence People Group	30	4		34	33	3		36	2
	Estate & Infrastructure Group	76	13		89	72	11		83	-6
	Joint Operations Command	1			1	1			1	0
	Navy	1	2		3	1	2		3	0
	Strategy Policy & Intelligence	1			1	1	1		2	1
	VCDF	98	9		107	92	9		101	-6
SA Total		1,343	826	3	2,172	1,342	793	4	2,139	-33
TAS	Air Force	1			1	1			1	0
	Army	9			9	8			8	-1
	Chief Finance Officer	14			14	13	1		14	0
	Chief Information Officer	1			1					-1
	Def Science & Technology Gp	10	6		16	10	5		15	-1
	Defence People Group	2			2	2			2	0
	Estate & Infrastructure Group	26	2		28	26	2		28	0
TAS Total		72	8		80	68	8		76	-4
VIC	Air Force	152	31		183	150	34		184	1
	Army	183	10		193	156	8		164	-29
	Capability Acq & Sustain Gp	1,025	294		1,319	997	280		1,277	-42
	Chief Finance Officer	145	37		182	142	35		177	-5
	Chief Information Officer	122	31		153	123	27		150	-3
	Def Science & Technology Gp	287	369	3	659	285	359	2	646	-13
	Defence Executive Support	31	3		34	32	6		38	4
	Defence People Group	295	11		306	298	11		309	3
	Estate & Infrastructure Group	295	37		332	281	36		317	-15
	Navy	21			21	18			18	-3
	Strategy Policy & Intelligence	88	7		95	89	8		97	2
	VCDF	320	44		364	323	42		365	1
VIC Total		2,964	874	3	3,841	2,894	846	2	3,742	-99

State/Territory by Group/Services		14 September 2015				31 January 2016				Changes
		APS 1-6	Senior Officers	Senior Executives	Total	APS 1-6	Senior Officers	Senior Executives	Total	
WA	Air Force	16	2		18	16	2		18	0
	Army	47	2		49	48	2		50	1
	Capability Acq & Sustain Gp	143	41		184	135	35		170	-14
	Chief Finance Officer	26	1		27	23	1		24	-3
	Chief Information Officer	10	1		11	10	1		11	0
	Def Science & Technology Gp	16	28		44	17	27		44	0
	Defence Executive Support	10			10	9			9	-1
	Defence People Group	20	1		21	19	1		20	-1
	Estate & Infrastructure Group	60	7		67	58	8		66	-1
	Joint Operations Command	2			2	2			2	0
	Navy	22	2		24	23	4		27	3
	Strategy Policy & Intelligence	6	3		9	7	5		12	3
	VCDF	59	9		68	54	6		60	-8
WA Total		437	97		534	421	92		513	-21
Overseas	Capability Acq & Sustain Gp	1	4		5	6	21		27	22
	Chief Finance Officer		1		1	1	4		5	4
	Chief Information Officer						1		1	1
	Def Science & Technology Gp	5	14		19	10	22		32	13
	Navy		1		1		1		1	0
	Strategy Policy & Intelligence	9	32	3	44	8	44	3	55	11
Overseas Total		15	52	3	70	25	93	3	121	51
Grand Total		13,824	5,647	132	19,603	13,537	5,362	122	19,021	-582

Notes: Based on substantive level and location.

The organisational structure used is as at 31 January 2016.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2015

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Staff – Staffing Reductions

Question reference number: 95

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) How many staff reductions/voluntary redundancies have occurred?
 - (i) What was the reason for these reductions?
- (b) Were any of these reductions involuntary redundancies? If yes, provide details.
- (c) Are there any plans for further staff reductions/voluntary redundancies? If so, please advise details including if there is a reduction target, how this will be achieved, and if any services/programs will be cut.
- (d) If there are plans for staff reductions, please give the reason why these are happening.
- (e) Are there any plans for involuntary redundancies? If yes, provide details.
- (f) How many ongoing staff left the department/agency? What classification were these staff?
- (g) How many non-ongoing staff left department/agency from? What classification were this staffs?
- (h) What are the voluntary redundancy packages offered? Please detail for each staff level and position
- (i) How do the packages differ from the default public service package?
- (j) How is the department/agency funding the packages?

Answer:

- (a) Over the period 14 September 2015 to 28 February 2016, 1095 Australian Public Service employees (ongoing and non-ongoing) separated from the Department of Defence. Of these, 346 were through voluntary redundancy.
- (b) One (1) employee separated through an involuntarily redundancy. The employee was an ongoing APS 2. The position was no longer required as part of reform in Defence.

(c)-(d) The 2015-16 Portfolio Additional Estimates Statements advised a revised estimate for the size of Defence's Australian Public Service workforce by the end of 2015-16 of approximately 17,500 Full Time Equivalent staff. This estimate is based on known patterns of recruitment and separations, including the Voluntary Redundancy program. Additionally, the 2016 Defence White Paper provides for a future APS workforce of around 18,200 to enable key initiatives to be progressed.

(e) No.

(f)-(g) See table below.

Substantive Classification	Non-ongoing	Ongoing	Total
Trainee	7	6	13
Grad		5	5
APS 1	27	2	29
APS 2	40	39	79
APS 3	1	55	56
APS 4		90	90
APS 5	1	130	131
APS 6	1	169	170
EL 1	2	362	364
EL 2	8	133	141
SES 1		8	8
SES 2		5	5
SES 3	2	2	4
Total	89	1006	1095

(h) A Voluntary redundancy package comprises the following elements.

- (i) a severance benefit of two weeks salary for each completed year of continuous service for severance pay purposes, plus a pro-rata payment of subsequent months of service with a minimum payment of four 4 weeks salary and a maximum of 48 weeks salary. The amount of the severance benefit cannot be less than the employee's entitlement to redundancy pay under the National Employment Standards;

- (ii) payment in lieu of notice of either four weeks salary, or five weeks if the employee is over 45 years of age and has at least five years continuous service;
- (iii) payment in lieu of long service leave (for employees with a minimum of one year's service) and annual leave credits;
- (iv) a special benefit of four weeks salary if the employee accepts retrenchment and is terminated within four weeks of the date of the formal offer of voluntary retrenchment; and
- (v) the employee's superannuation benefits.

The amount of the package will differ based on the employees length of service and pay rate.

- (i) The package is the same as the default public service package with the exception of the special benefit which is unique to Defence.
- (j) Packages are funded within the existing Defence budget.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Staffing Recruitment

Question reference number: 96

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) How many ongoing staff have been recruited? What classification are these staff?
- (b) How many non-ongoing positions exist or have been created? What classifications are these staff?
- (c) How many staff have been employed on contract and what is the average length of their employment period?

Answer:

- (a) Defence has recruited 171 ongoing APS employees over the period 14 September 2015 to 31 January 2016. The breakdown of APS classification is as follows:

APS Trainee	42
APS Graduate	1
APS Level 2	20
APS Level 3	24
APS Level 4	14
APS Level 5	26
APS Level 6	26
Executive Level 1	13
Executive Level 2	4
SES Level 2	1

- (b) The number of non-ongoing positions that existed, or were created, over the period 14 September 2015 to 31 January 2016 was 280. It should be noted that not all positions were filled. The breakdown of APS classification was:

	Existed	Created
APS Level 2	4	34
APS Level 3	11	-

APS Level 4	11	1
APS Level 5	10	1
APS Level 6	51	3
Executive Level 1	79	3
Executive Level 2	64	2
SES Level 1	4	1
SES Level 2	1	-

It should be noted that Defence reviews and abolishes positions that have been vacant for prolonged periods. While positions have also been created, the net result is that the overall number of positions (both ongoing and non-ongoing) will continue to change. This process will continue into the future.

- (c) Over the period 14 September 2015 to 31 January 2016, 66 non-ongoing employees commenced work with Defence. This includes employees engaged on specified term contracts, those engaged for specified tasks, and those engaged for irregular or intermittent work. Of these, 19 were employed on specified term contracts, with an average initial contract length of 517 days.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Kitchen Appliances

Question reference number: 97

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (1) Has the department/agency purchased, leased or rented any kitchen appliances over the value of \$1000?
 - (a) If yes, provide a list that includes the type of appliance, the cost, the amount, and any ongoing costs such as purchase of consumables and when the appliance was purchased?
 - (b) Why were the appliances purchased?
 - (c) Has there been a noticeable difference in staff productivity since the appliances were purchased? Are staff leaving the office premises less during business hours as a result?
 - (d) Where did the funding for the appliances come from?
 - (e) Who has access?
 - (f) Who is responsible for the maintenance of the appliances? How much was spent on maintenance, include a list of what maintenance has been undertaken. Where does the funding for maintenance come from?
 - (g) What are the other ongoing costs of the appliances?

Answer:

- (1) Yes. Between the period 14 September 2015 and 31 January 2016 Defence purchased the items listed below. These items form part of the normal operations of Defence and were funded through Departmental appropriation. These items are supported and maintained in the normal course of business.

VENDOR	KITCHEN APPLIANCES	COUNT	TOTAL
MARTIN LUCK FOOD SERVICES SOLUTION	PORTABLE AMENITIES KIOSK	1	\$138,361.00
COMMERCIAL FOOD EQUIPMENT	OVEN COMBITHERM STEAM MODEL	3	\$18,957.27
A J BAKER AND SONS PTY LT	REFRIGERATOR SKOPE 3 DOOR	1	\$5,420.10
ROBAND AUSTRALIAN P L CRO	BAIN MARIE	1	\$2,548.00
ROBAND AUSTRALIAN P L CRO	BAIN MARIE	1	\$2,548.00
QUALITY EQUIPMENT	BAIN MARIE	1	\$1,931.82
	GRAND TOTAL	8	\$169,766.19

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates - 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Departmental Boards

Question reference number: 98

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) how often has each board met, break down by board name;
- (b) what travel expenses have been incurred;
- (c) what has been the average attendance at board meetings;
- (d) List each member's attendance at meetings;
- (e) how does the board deal with conflict of interest;
- (f) what conflicts of interest have been registered;
- (g) what remuneration has been provided to board members;
- (h) how does the board dismiss board members who do not meet attendance standards?
- (i) Have any requests been made to ministers to dismiss board members?
- (j) Please list board members who have attended less than 51% of meetings
- (k) what have been the catering costs for the board meetings held during this period? Please break down the cost list.

Answer:

- (a) – (k) Please see the attached table.

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015 to 29 February 2016:

Board	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k
Australian Strategic Policy Institute Council	2	\$25,594.37	79%	Mr Loosley – 2/2 Mr Jennings – 2/2 Mr Conran – 0/2 LTGEN (Retd) Gillespie – 2/2 Prof Jones – 2/2 AVM (Retd) Staib – 2/2 Prof Yasmeen – 1/2	Council members complete a Confidentiality Obligations and Conflict of Interest Declaration and Director's Declaration. Council members' declarations of interest on agenda items are recorded in the minutes. Members abstain from deliberation on those issues. Council policies cover Code of Conduct, Conflict of Interest and Public Interest Disclosure.	Nil	\$10,354.92	Under the Constitution Council members can pass a resolution to cancel a Member's membership.	No	Mr Conran missed two meetings due to illness and leave.	\$1,904.36 full-day catering for two meetings.
Royal Australian Navy Relief Trust Fund	2	Nil	72%	RADM Wolski, - 2/2 CAPT Wittwer – 2/2 LCDR Skousgaard – 2/2 CAPT Batchler - 1/2 CMDR Gillett – 1/2 CMDR Kisorbo – 1/2 WO Brown – 1/2	Conflict of Interest Declaration is signed by each member. No trustees are able to use the RANRTF products.	Nil	Nil	The Chair would write to the Minister for Defence, via Chief of Navy, seeking termination of the Member.	No	CAPT Batchler, CMDR Gillett, CMDR Kisorbo and WO Brown attended 50% of meetings due to short notice service requirements.	Nil

Board	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k
Royal Australian Air Force Welfare Trust Fund	2	Nil	67%	AIRCDRE Russell – 1/2 AIRCDRE Thompson – 1/2 AIRCDRE Birrer - 1/2 GPCAPT Wallis - 2/2 AIRCDRE Roberts - 2/2 FLTTLT Frank – 1/2	Conflict of interest addressed in Code of Conduct.	Nil	Nil	Ministerial approval required for dismissal.	No	AIRCDRE Russell, AIRCDRE Thompson, AIRCDRE Birrer, and FLTTLT Frank were absent due to official RAAF duty.	Nil
Woomera Prohibited Area Advisory Board	0	Nil	N/A	N/A	Members provide notice of conflict of interest to the Board through 'Private Interests Declaration'. Members are excused from decision making on those matters.	Nil	Chairperson \$2,218.66 (GST incl) Deputy Chair \$1,774.92 (GST incl)	No Board member has been dismissed due to non-attendance. Non-attendance is not referenced in Terms of Reference; however the Business rules require that a quorum is present. The Board would consider individual circumstances case by case.	No	N/A	N/A
Australian Military Forces Relief Trust Fund	2	Nil	77%	BRIG Daniel 1/2) COL Zanatta – 1/2 MAJ Denton 2/2 Mr Tye – 2/2 BRIG L Wilton 1/2 WO1 McFarlane - 1/2 Mr Heenan – 1/2 Ms Radcliffe – 1/2	Under Section 14 of the PGPA Act Rule 2014 the Chair seeks from the Trustees declaration of interest on Agenda items.	Nil	Nil	The Minister may under section 5(2) of the <i>Services Trust Fund Act 1947</i> terminate the appointment of any trustee. Accordingly the Board would need to seek Ministerial support to dismiss a board member.	No	Nil	Nil
AAF Company	1	Nil	75%	BRIG Daniel – 1/1 BRIG Pearce – 1/1 LTCOL Follett – 1/1 MAJ Wyatt – 1/1 WO Spinks – 1/1 Ms Radcliffe – 1/1	Under Section 14 of the PGPA Act Rule 2014 the Chair seeks from the Trustees declaration of interest on Agenda items.	Nil	Nil	Para 24(2)(b) of the AAF Constitution provides the Chief of Army with the authority to remove a director before the end of the director's period of office .	No	Nil	Nil
Defence Industry Innovation Board (DIIB)	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	The DIIB Terms of Reference has a conflict of interest clause. The meeting report records when the Chair and members disclose any professional interest in matters considered by the DIIB.	Nil	Nil	Not covered in the DIIB Terms of Reference.	No	Nil	Nil

Board	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k
Defence Families of Australia (DFA)	1	\$11,840.57	80%	Mrs Ritchie -1/1 Ms Nerio – 1/1 Ms Hollington – 1/1 Ms Penny – 1/1 Ms Purton – 1/1 Ms Stratton – 1/1 Ms Morris – 1/1 Ms Hughes – 1/1 Ms Sirois – 1/1 Mrs Sasse – 0/1 Mrs Kerrisk – 0/1	National Executive Member must adhere to the DFA internal Code of Conduct and Values.	Nil	Remuneration Tribunal Sitting Fee \$392 and Tier 2 travel.	Annual Executive Committee members' performance review. Exec Committee Members found to be non-compliant under the performance management or Code of Conduct are managed accordingly.	No	Nil	\$339.20 Full-day catering for one meeting
Royal Australian Navy Central Canteens Board	4	Nil	75%	CAPT Murray – 4/4 LCDR Hill – 3/4 CMDR Blackburn – 3/4 LCDR Rossendell – 3/4 CMDR Metzl 4/4 WO Downey 4/4 LEUT O'Connor – 3/3	Conflicts of interest are part of the agenda and are declared before the meeting commences, directors do not participate in the vote.	30/09/2015 - CAPT Metzl advised he had met representatives of the travel company for the Battlefield Tour at a recent function at the RAN Heritage Centre.	Nil	The Chief of Navy is informed and the Member is removed by the Chief of Navy.	No	Nil	\$731 catering for four meetings.
Young Endeavour Advisory Board	3	Nil	59%	Mr Baillieu - 2/3 RADM Mayer – 2/3 Mr Dixon – 1/3 Ms Daniel – 3/3 CDRE Kafer – 3/3 Ms Traill – 0/3 Mr Blackmore – 1/3 Mr Moss – 3/3 Ms Kuehn – 1/3	Requirement to declare conflicts of interest to the Minister prior to appointment. Subsequently, disclosure and exclusion from discussions if required.	The ex-officio members have declared interests associated with their Defence appointments.	Gross fees earned (not yet paid) during the reporting period: Mr Baillieu - \$1,035 Mr Dixon - \$384 Ms Daniel - \$1,161 Ms Traill - \$0 Mr Blackmore - \$384 Ms Kuehn - \$384 Total - \$3,348	Attendance standards are not specified in the Young Endeavour Advisory Board Terms of Reference. Individual circumstances are considered case by case.	No	Mr Dixon – 1/3 Ms Traill – 0/3 Mr Blackmore – 1/3 Ms Kuehn – 1/3	Nil
RAAF Welfare Recreational Company	3	Nil	89%	AIRCDRE Elfverson – 3/3 GPCAPT Stothart- 3/3 WGCDR Gilbert – 2/3 SQNLDR Samin – 3/3 FLT LT Higgs – 3/3 Mr Perry – 2/3	At the beginning of each meeting, members are asked to so declare. To date there have been no declarations.	Nil	Nil	The Chair would recommend to Chief of Air Force that a Directorship should be ceased.	No	Nil	Nil

Board	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k
RAAF Veterans' Residences Trust	2	Nil	100%	AIRCDRE Tindal 2/2 Mr Finkelstein 2/2 SQNLDR Oakden 2/2	Trustees to decide course of action.	Nil	Nil	Through the Trust's responsible minister.	No	Nil	Nil
First Principles Review Oversight Board	10 (6 telephone, 4 face-to-face)	\$30,874.68.	90%	Mr Peever 9/10 Mr Hill 9/10 Mr Tanner 9/10 Ms Smyth 9/10 Mr Leahy 7/10 Mr McDowell 9/10	Conflict of interest legal clauses in individual contracts state potential conflicts must be formally disclosed and the Board's operating rules state individuals must excuse themselves from relevant discussions.	Each Board Member has provided advice about other appointments.	The board members are paid \$1,650 (GST inclusive) per day or \$825 (GST inclusive) for per half day.	The Chair of the Board would seek advice from the Minister for Defence.	No	Nil	Catering for meetings: 29 September 2015: \$200 3 November 2015: \$230 25 November 2015: \$350 19 February 2016: \$230
Army & Air Force Canteen Service (AAFCANS)	3	\$5,773	94%	Mr A. Tregaskis – 3/3 Mr S. McGrow – 3/3 AIRCDRE I. Pearson – 2/3 BRIG G. Finney - 1/1 BRIG C. Purdey - 2/2 Ms L. Taylor – 3/3 Mr P. Fairlie – 3/3	Each member declares their interest or directorship in other organisations at the beginning of each meeting.	Nil	Paid in accordance with Remuneration Tribunal Determination 2015/20 – Part Time Offices and earlier related determinations; and Remuneration Tribunal Determination 2015/19 - Principal Executive Office: Band B, and earlier related determinations. Mr S McGrow \$259,243 pa Mr A Tregaskis - \$62,908 pa Ms L Taylor - \$48,290 pa Mr P Fairlie - \$39,880 pa	Dismissal of directors is governed by AAFCANS Regulations s10(5)(7).	No	Nil	\$379 Morning tea for 3 meetings

Board	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k
Defence Reserves Support Council (DSRC)	1 Executive Meeting 1 National Council meeting	\$59,554	Executive – 100% National Council – 85%	Executive: Mr Blackmore - 1/1 Prof Lampard -1/1 Ms Pascarl – 1/1 Mr Behm - 1/1 MAJGEN Spence – 1/1 National Council: Mr Blackmore – 1/1 Prof Lampard – 1/1 Mr Behm – 1/1 MAJGEN Spence 1/1 Ms Goody – 1/1 Mr Todd – 1/1 Mr Moss – 1/1 Mr Radford – 1/1 Mr Carey - 1/1 Dr Cannon - 1/1 Mr Trench – 1/1 Mr Young – 1/1 Dr Calma – 1/1 Mr Caputo – 1/1 Ms Christopherson - 1/1 Ms Crouch – 1/1 RADM Doolan – 1/1 Mr Fadelli – 1/1 MAJGEN Irving – 1/1 Mr James – 1/1 Mr Nielsen – 1/1 Mr O’Callaghan – 1/1 Mr Overton – 1/1 Ms Sirois – 1/1 Ms Bull – 0/1 Mr Borowick – 0/1 Mr Beresford-Wylie – 0/1 LEUT Watkin – 0/1	DRSC Business Rules state ‘avoid, and where unavoidable disclose, conflicts of interest.’	Nil	National Chair - \$33,950 pa Executive Member - \$28,860 pa State & Territory Chairs - \$523 per day on DRSC business Members - \$393 per day on DRSC business	Executives cease to hold office if the Minister terminates the appointment. Senior Member, State and Territory Chairs and Members cease to hold office if the National Executive terminates the appointment.	Nil	Executive – Nil National Council - Ms Bull Mr Borowick Mr Beresford-Wylie LEUT Watkin	\$18,950 DRSC National Council Meeting and formal dinner 27 November 2015

Board	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k
Religious Advisory Committee to the Services	2	\$25,932	100%	Rev Earl - 2/2 Rabbi Genende – 2/2 Very Rev Prof Harman – 2/2 Bishop Lambert – 2/2 Rev Lock – 2/2 Monsignor O’Keefe - 2/2 Mohamadu Nawas Saleem – 2/2	Members appointed have not been asked to declare any conflict of interest.	Nil	Chair \$732 per day Member \$659 per day	Nominating Religious Group would recommend a new appointment to the Minister	No	Nil	\$302.85 Catering for one meeting \$333.95 Catering for the second meeting
Defence Honours and Awards Appeals Tribunal	2	\$10,815.16	95%	Mr M. Sullivan 2/2 BRIG (Retd) M. Bornholt 2/2 RADM (Retd) J. Goldrick 2/2 Ms N. Isenberg 2/2 The Hon P. Lindsay 2/2 BRIG (Retd) K. O’Brien 2/2 AVM J. Quaipe (Retd) 2/2 Mr R. Rowe 1/2 Ms J. Schwager 2/2 Mr G. Mowbray 1/1	Individual Tribunal Members are asked to voluntarily declare potential conflicts of interest to the Chair of the Tribunal.	Nil	Remuneration for Tribunal Members for the reporting period was in accordance with Remuneration Tribunal Determination 2015/08, which stated that the Chair daily rate was \$1076, and the Member daily rate was \$807.	The Board does not have the power to dismiss its members. However, the Minister may terminate the appointment of a member in certain circumstances.	No	Nil	Meeting 1: \$149.50 Meeting 2: \$129.58
Defence Housing Australia (DHA)	12	\$30,266.27	97.3%	Hon S Macdonald 12/12 CDRE V McConachie 12/12 Ms J Mason 4/5 Ms C Holley 8/8 Ms J Williams 12/12 Hon A Ferguson 11/12 Mr M Brady 12/12 Mr r Fisher 1/1 Mr P Howman 1/1	For the purpose of section 29 of the Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act 2013 and the Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Rule 2014, the DHA Board disclose the nature and extent of material personal interests and how the interest relates to the affairs of DHA.	Each Director has provided at least one disclosure since 14 September 2015 depending on the nature of their interests.	Members are remunerated in accordance with the Remuneration Tribunal’s Determination 2015/20: <i>Remuneration and Allowances for Holders of Part time Public Office</i> . For the chair of the Board, the remuneration is set at \$112,290 pa. For Directors, the remuneration is set at \$56,150 pa. Directors whom are also members of the Board Audit Committee also receive an additional fee (\$15,370 pa for the Chair of this Committee or \$7,690 pa for a member of this Committee).	The Board does not have the legislative authority to dismiss members	Nil	Nil	\$922.30 Lunches and mornings teas for 12 meetings

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Corporate Cars

Question reference number: 99

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question: Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September 2015:

- (a) How many cars are owned by each department/agency?
 - i. Where are the cars located?
 - ii. What are the cars used for?
 - iii. What is the cost of each car during the specified period?
 - iv. How far did each car travel during the specified period?
- (b) How many cars are leased by each department/agency?
 - i. Where are the cars located?
 - ii. What are the cars used for?
 - iii. What is the cost of each car during the specified period?
 - iv. How far did each car travel during the specified period?

Answer:

- (a) As at 31 August 2016, Defence owned 2,353 passenger vehicles, or cars, which includes sedans, station wagons, and multi-purpose vehicles (excluding four-wheel drives, buses and trucks and vehicles used on operations). This number incorporates 48 vehicles overseas across 23 countries.
 - (i) These vehicles are located throughout Australia and overseas as follows:
 - Australian Capital Territory – 216
 - New South Wales – 715
 - Northern Territory – 195
 - Queensland – 462
 - South Australia – 170
 - Tasmania – 25
 - Victoria – 349
 - Western Australia – 173
 - Overseas – 48
 - (ii) These vehicles are used to meet departmental administrative requirements, representational duties, support training activities and base support operations.

- (iii) The cost of owning these passenger vehicles during the period 15 September 2015 to 31 August 2016 was estimated at \$5,184 per vehicle, comprising estimated capital cost (average cost less revenue expected), operating, maintenance and domestic fuel costs.
 - (iv) A complete data set of the distance travelled for all Defence-owned vehicles during this period is not readily available. To attempt to provide and verify this level of detail within the allocated timeframe for response would involve an unreasonable diversion of resources.
- (b) During the period 15 September 2015 to 31 August 2016, 64 passenger vehicles were leased to Defence. This number incorporates 11 overseas vehicles on lease in six countries.
- (i) These Defence leased passenger vehicles are located throughout Australia and overseas as follows:
 - Australian Capital Territory – 15
 - New South Wales – 8
 - Northern Territory – 1
 - Queensland – 3
 - South Australia – 19
 - Tasmania – 1
 - Victoria – 3
 - Western Australia – 3
 - Overseas – 11
 - (ii) These vehicles are used to meet departmental administrative requirements, representational duties, support training activities and base support operations.
 - (iii) The cost of leasing these passenger vehicles during the period 15 September 2015 to 31 August 2016 was estimated at \$10,347 per vehicle.
 - (iv) The distance travelled for individual Defence leased vehicles during the period 15 September 2015 to 31 August 2016 was estimated at 10,923 km per vehicle.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Contractors and Consultants

Question reference number: 100

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) What has been the average time period for the department/agency paid its accounts to contractors, consultants or others?
- (b) How many payments owed (as a number and as a percentage of the total) have been paid in under 30 days?
- (c) How many payments owed (as a number and as a percentage of the total) have been paid in between 30 and 60 days?
- (d) How many payments owed (as a number and as a percentage of the total) have been paid in between 60 and 90 days?
- (e) How many payments owed (as a number and as a percentage of the total) have been paid in between 90 and 120 days?
- (f) How many payments owed (as a number and as a percentage of the total) have been paid in over 120 days?
- (g) For accounts not paid within 30 days, is interest being paid on overdue amounts and if so how much has been paid by the portfolio/department agency since Estimates, 2014?
- (h) Where interest is being paid, what rate of interest is being paid and how is this rate determined?

Answer:

- (a) The average time for the Department of Defence to pay accounts (including credit card payments) from 14 September 2015 to 29 February 2016 was 2.80 days.
- (b) 937,136 payments were made in 30 days or less which represents 99.29% of all payments for the period.
- (c) 5,128 payments were made between 30 and 60 days which represents 0.54% of all payments for the period.
- (d) 896 payments were made between 60 and 90 days which represents 0.09% of all payments for the period.

- (e) 285 payments were made between 90 and 120 days which represents 0.03% of all payments for the period.
- (f) 472 payments were made in over 120 days which represents 0.05% of all payments for the period.
- (g) For accounts not paid within 30 days, a total of 82 interest payments have been made since the change of Prime Minister and 29 February 2016. A total of \$11,470.13 has been paid.
- (h) The rate of interest paid is outlined in the table below.

Period	Interest Rates
July - September	9.15%
October - December	9.14%
January - March	9.22%

The interest paid is in accordance with the rate and methodology detailed in the Supplier Pay On-Time or Pay Interest Policy (Resource Management Guide No. 417), or Procurement On-Time Payment Policy for Small Business (Finance Circular No. 2012/02) for contracts commenced prior to 1 July 2014.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Corporate cards – Charges and misuse

Question reference number: 101

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) Provide a breakdown of any changes to employment classifications that have access to a corporate credit card.
- (b) Have there been any changes to action taken in the event that the corporate credit card is misused?
- (c) Have there been any changes to how corporate credit card use is monitored?
- (d) Have any instances of corporate credit card misuse have been discovered during the specified period?
- (e) If so, please list staff classification and what the misuse was, and the action taken.
- (f) Have there been any changes to what action is taken to prevent corporate credit card misuse?
- (g) How any credit cards available to the Minister or their office? If so, please list by classification. Has there been any misuse of credit cards by the Minister or their office? Has any action been taken against the Minister or their office for credit card misuse? If so, list each occurrence, including the cost of the misuse.

Answer:

- (a) No changes have been made.
- (b) No.
- (c) Yes. The Chief Finance Officer Group has continued organisational improvements and applied more rigour to the monitoring and control of credit cards. This includes analysing and monitoring all transactions, including taxis and hire cars.
- (d) Yes. There have been twelve instances of misuse investigated during the period 14 September 2015 to 31 January 2016 by Audit and Fraud Control Division.
- (e) Please see below table for details.

	Classification	Misuse	Action Taken
1	SGT	Theft and Misuse of DTC by unknown third party	No suspect identified. Full recovery from member
2	FLTLT	Unauthorised use of DTC for personal travel expenses	Member discharged for other reasons. Full recovery from member
3	PTE	Unauthorised use of Defence Fuel Card for personal expenditure	Detention in DFCE. Full recovery from member.
4	PTE	Unauthorised use of DTC for cash withdrawals	Dismissal from ADF. Recovery ongoing.
5	PO	Misuse of Defence Cab Charge E-ticket for personal use	Conviction quashed.
6	CPL	Theft of DTC and DPC by unknown third party	No suspect identified.
7	PTE	Theft and unauthorised use of DTC by unknown third party	No suspect identified.
8	AB	Unauthorised use of DTC for a cash withdrawal	Accidental use determined. Full recovery from member.
9	AB	Theft and unauthorised use of another member's DTC for cash withdrawals and purchases	Offender discharged from ADF prior to offences. Charges not recommended. Recovery ongoing.
10	AB	Unauthorised use of DTC for travel expenses without approval	Charges not recommended.
11	AB	Unauthorised use of Defence Cab Charge Eticket by unknown third party	No suspect identified.
12	LAC	Unauthorised use of Defence Cab Charge E-ticket for travel expenses without approval	Formal counselling.

- (f) In January 2016 Defence implemented Credit Card Governance arrangements and together with the increased focus on monitoring, the controls around Credit cards have been strengthened.

- (g) There are two corporate cards (Cabcharge Fastcards) available for use by the Minister's Office. There has been no misuse of these cards that Defence is aware of.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Hire Cars

Question reference number: 102

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) How much did each department/agency spend on hire cars during the specified period? Provide a breakdown of each business group in each department/agency.
- (b) What are the reasons for hire car costs?
- (c) How much did the department spend on hire cars during the specified period for their minister or minister's office?

Answer:

- (a) Defence's financial management systems indicate Defence spent \$4,240,166.58 on hire cars for the period 14 September 2015 to 31 January 2016. A breakdown by Group is provided below.

GROUP	TOTAL
ARMY	\$1,123,390.14
AIR FORCE	\$1,065,281.75
CAPABILITY ACQUISITION & SUSTAINMENT GROUP	\$581,120.83
NAVY	\$359,248.86
VICE CHIEF DEFENCE FORCE	\$231,626.18
ESTATE AND INFRASTRUCTURE GROUP	\$223,733.84
DEFENCE SCIENCE TECHONOLGY GROUP	\$216,471.07
DEFENCE PEOPLE GROUP	\$148,110.53
INTELLIGENCE & SECURITY GROUP	\$66,801.68
DEFENCE EXECUTIVE SUPPORT	\$59,226.58
JOINT OPERATIONS COMMAND	\$44,125.30
CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER	\$38,659.37
CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER GROUP	\$33,369.78
CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT GROUP	\$32,055.19
STRATEGY GROUP	\$16,945.48
GRAND TOTAL	\$4,240,166.58

- (c) Hire cars are used by Defence for operational, business, training, removal and condition of service leave associated travel.
- (c) Nil.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Ministerial Functions

Question reference number: 103

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) Provide a list of all formal functions or forms of hospitality conducted for the Minister. Include:
 - (i) The guest list of each function
 - (ii) The party or individual who initiated the request for the function
 - (iii) The menu, program or list of proceedings of the function
 - (iv) A list of drinks consumed at the function
- (b) Provide a list of the current wine, beer or other alcoholic beverages in stock or on order in the Minister's office. Breakdown by item, quantity and cost.

Answer:

(a) (i), (ii) and (iv) This question has been answered under Question on Notice No. 9 from Additional Budget Estimates 10 February 2016.

(b) This question has been previously answered under Question on Notice No. 101 from Additional Estimates of 26 February 2014. There are no leftover beverages from official functions in stock or on order for any of the Ministers' Offices.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Red Tape Reduction

Question reference number: 104

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) Please detail changes to structures, officials, offices, units, taskforce or other processes has the department dedicated to meeting the government's red tape reduction targets
 - (i) What is the progress of that red tape reduction target?
- (b) How many officers have been placed in those units and at what level?
- (c) How have they been recruited?
- (d) What process was used for their appointment?
- (e) What is the total cost of this unit?
- (f) What is the estimated total salary cost of the officers assigned to the unit?
- (g) Do members of the unit have access to cabinet documents?
- (h) Please list the security classification and date the classification was issued for each officer, broken down by APS or SES level, in the red tape reduction unit or similar body.
- (i) What is the formal name given to this unit/taskforce/team/workgroup or agency within the department?

Answer:

- (a), (b) and (i) Defence has assigned responsibility for deregulation policy issues to the Directorate of Financial Policy (DFP). Within DFP, personnel working on red tape reduction issues are 1 x Executive Level 2, 1 x Executive Level 1 and 1 x Australian Public Service Level 6. The Directorate is supervised by 1 x Senior Executive Service Band 2 and 1 x Senior Executive Service Band 1, both of whom work on red tape reduction issues as and when required. This team is supported by a Defence Deregulation Action Network (DAN) that consists of one representative from each of the Groups and Services within Defence. The DAN coordinates input to DFP and meets on an 'as required' basis.
- (a) (i) The Department of Defence has identified a total of \$39.1 million in savings in 2015 to the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet for reporting in the 2015 Annual Red Tape Reduction Report.

(c), (d), (e), (f) and (g) These questions have been previously answered under Question on Notice No.102 from Additional Estimates of 26 February 2014. This response remains extant.

- (h) SES Band 2 – Negative Vetting Level 2 (2011)
SES Band 1 – Negative Vetting Level 1 (2011)
Executive Level 2 – Negative Vetting Level 1 (2008)
Executive Level 1 – Negative Vetting Level 1 (2006)
Australian Public Service Level 6 – Negative Vetting Level 1 (2013)

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Building and Land Leases

Question reference number: 105

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (1) How much land (if any) does the Department or agencies or authorities or Government corporation within each portfolio own or lease?
- (2) Please list by each individual land holding, the size of the piece of land, the location of that piece of land and the latest valuation of that piece of land, where that land is owned or leased by the Department, or agency or authority or Government Corporation within that portfolio? (In regards to this question please ignore land upon which Australian Defence force bases are located. Non Defence Force base land is to be included)
- (3) List the current assets, items or purse (buildings, facilities or other) on the land identified above.
 - (a) What is the current occupancy level and occupant of the items identified in (3)?
 - (b) What is the value of the items identified in (3)?
 - (c) What contractual or other arrangements are in place for the items identified in (3)?
- (4) How many buildings (if any) does the Department or agencies or authorities or Government Corporation within each portfolio own or lease?
- (5) Please list by each building owned, its name, the size of the building in terms of square metres, the location of that of that building and the latest valuation of that building, where that building is owned by the Department, or agency or authority or Government corporation within that portfolio? (In regards to this question please ignore buildings that are situated on Australian Defence force bases. Non Defence Force base buildings are to be included).
- (6) In regards to any building identified in Q4, please also detail, the occupancy rate as expressed as a percentage of the building size. If occupancy is identified as less than 100%, for what is the remaining space used?

Answer:

- (1) The Department of Defence has approximately 2.75 million hectares of land in its portfolio (2.7 million hectares owned, 399,702 hectares leased). Since the last response in October 2014, a re-categorisation exercise was undertaken in order to provide a more accurate report on leased land.
- (2) Excluding land upon which Australian Defence Force bases are located, the requested details are provided at Attachment A. The valuation of leased land is not known.
- (3) The requested details are provided at Attachment B.
 - (a) Current occupancy levels are provided at Attachment B.
 - (b) The total value of the items identified in (3) is approximately \$210 million.
 - (c) Appropriate tenure agreements, for example leases, are in place.
- (4) Excluding buildings on Defence Force bases, Defence has 56 building leases on 54 office accommodation sites (two sites each have two leases for different parts of the buildings).
- (5) Not applicable to Defence.
- (6) The Department of Defence provided occupancy data on its office accommodation for the September 2015 Australian Government Property Data Collection (PRODACC) reporting system. This data is collected for building office accommodation which is greater than 500m². The Department of Defence does not have data for building office accommodation that is less than 500m². The requested details are provided at Attachment C.

No.	Land Holding	City	State	Size (m2)	Leased / Owned	Latest Valuation of Land
1	24 - 28 Fairbairn Avenue	Canberra Airport	ACT	-	Leased	-
2	Canberra Airport Airport Cabling Licence	Canberra Airport	ACT	-	Leased	-
3	Naval Wharf Facilities, Bindijine Beach Beecroft Pen.	Jervis Bay	ACT	72	Leased	-
4	HMAS Creswell Seabed Land Below Mhwm	Jervis Bay	ACT	2,570	Leased	-
5	141 Flemington Road	Mitchell	ACT	-	Leased	-
6	Brindabella Range	Mt Ginini	ACT	2,323	Leased	-
7	Air Force Cadet (412 Sqn) Cnr Dalton Place & Avalon Street	Albury Airport	NSW	2,391	Leased	-
8	Off Sport UNE Drive University of New England	Armidale	NSW	8,620	Leased	-
9	HMAS Penguin, Middle Head Road	Balmoral	NSW	4,490	Leased	-
10	Bathurst Regional Airport Melrose Drive	Bathurst	NSW	1,115	Leased	-
11	1-3 Windsock Way Bathurst Airport	Bathurst	NSW	3,221	Leased	-
12	Botany Road & Hill Street	Botany	NSW	1,840	Leased	-
13	Site 754, Camden Airport	Camden	NSW	-	Leased	-
14	Site 754, Camden Airport	Camden	NSW	2,991	Leased	-
15	Part Coffs Jetty, Foreshore Reserve	Coffs Harbour	NSW	2,480	Leased	-
16	119 Fitzroy Street	Cowra	NSW	1,214	Leased	-
17	Rifle Range, Orara West State Forest No 535	Dairyville	NSW	56,000	Leased	-
18	Spectacle Island	Drummoyne	NSW	-	Leased	-
19	Spectacle Island	Drummoyne	NSW	1,313	Leased	-
20	Off St George's Crecent	Drummoyne	NSW	-	Leased	-
21	Spectacle Island	Drummoyne	NSW	-	Leased	-
22	Part of the Seabed Twofold Bay	Eden	NSW	-	Leased	-
23	Bombing & Gunnery Range	Evans Head	NSW	5,010,000	Leased	-
24	Rifle & Bombing Ranges	Evans Head	NSW	-	Leased	-
25	Port Jackson Sydney (HMAS Kattabul)	Garden Island	NSW	43,434	Leased	-
26	Chowder Bay Road	Georges Heights	NSW	690	Leased	-
27	Ts Hawkesbury, Point Clare	Gosford	NSW	715	Leased	-
28	Theodolite Site	Hyams Beach	NSW	222	Leased	-
29	Repeater Station Site	Kings Tableland	NSW	-	Leased	-
30	Northcliff Drive	Lake Illawarra	NSW	656	Leased	-
31	Northcliff Drive	Lake Illawarra	NSW	-	Leased	-
32	Parachute Dropping Zone	Londonderry	NSW	2,510,000	Leased	-

No.	Land Holding	City	State	Size (m2)	Leased / Owned	Latest Valuation of Land
33	Newnes State Forest No748	Marrangaroo	NSW	1,260,000	Leased	-
34	Buckingbong State Forest No156	Morundah	NSW	-	Leased	-
35	Mount Heaton Repeater Stationsite, Freemans Hole Road	Mount Heaton	NSW	1	Leased	-
36	Brunkerville Freeman's Road	Mount Heaton	NSW	35	Leased	-
37	Obstruction Lights - Mt Jerrabomberra	Mount Jerrabomberra	NSW	1,212	Leased	-
38	Licence over Roadway	Mulwala	NSW	117,374	Leased	-
39	Yarrawonga to Oaklands Rail Line	Mulwala	NSW	-	Leased	-
40	Army Base	Myambat	NSW	210	Leased	-
41	HMAS Platypus Adderson Ave	Neutral Bay	NSW	-	Leased	-
42	HMAS Platypus Adderson Ave	Neutral Bay	NSW	3,385	Leased	-
43	180 Hanckel Rd	Oakville	NSW	15	Leased	-
44	Repeater Station Site	Point Lookout	NSW	-	Leased	-
45	Raymond Terrace Instrument Landing Site	Raymond Terrace	NSW	100	Leased	-
46	TS Culgoa	South West Rocks	NSW	-	Leased	-
47	Building Lot 23, Tamworth Airport	Tamworth	NSW	664	Leased	-
48	Parade Ground, Tamworth Airport	Tamworth	NSW	641	Leased	-
49	ILS Site, Comerong Island Road	Terara	NSW	100	Leased	-
50	Naval Reserve T S Vampire Dry Rock Road TS Vampire Dry	Terranora	NSW	2,800	Leased	-
51	RAAF Aerodrome, Forest Hill	Wagga Wagga	NSW	-	Leased	-
52	RAAF Aerodrome, Forest Hill	Wagga Wagga	NSW	-	Leased	-
53	RAAF Aerodrome, Forest Hill	Wagga Wagga	NSW	-	Leased	-
54	RAAF Aerodrome, Forest Hill	Wagga Wagga	NSW	-	Leased	-
55	Kapooka Enclosure Permit 56136	Wagga Wagga	NSW	-	Leased	-
56	Kapooka Enclosure Permit 56690	Wagga Wagga	NSW	-	Leased	-
57	Cliff Street	Watsons Bay	NSW	-	Leased	-
58	Shark Island Shark Point	Watsons Bay	NSW	-	Leased	-
59	HMAS Waterhen-Naval Base Land, Balls Head	Waverton	NSW	9,913	Leased	-
60	HMAS Waterhen-Naval Base Land, Balls Head	Waverton	NSW	31,700	Leased	-
61	Parachute Dropping Zone	Williamstown	NSW	172,400	Leased	-
62	Parachute Dropping Zone	Williamstown	NSW	2,674,000	Leased	-
63	Franki Ave & Margaret Street	Woolwich	NSW	8	Leased	-
64	Pt. Lot 3939, Airport	Alice Springs	NT	11,500	Leased	-

No.	Land Holding	City	State	Size (m2)	Leased / Owned	Latest Valuation of Land
65	Lot 2423 Butler Road	Alice Springs	NT	7,423,000	Leased	-
66	Norforce Depot, Town Gymnasium	Bathurst Island	NT	150	Leased	-
67	Point Fawcett Bathurst Island	Bathurst Island	NT	179,300	Leased	-
68	Lot 820 (A), Norforce Depot Garawa Street	Borrooloola	NT	13,000	Leased	-
69	Air Traffic Control Building, Darwin Airport	Darwin	NT	6,307	Leased	-
70	Lot 7248 Waterfront Precinct	Darwin	NT	-	Leased	-
71	Delamere Range Facility Buntine Highway	Delamere	NT	-	Leased	-
72	Part Lot 141, Koorunga Street	Elliott	NT	9,000	Leased	-
73	Lot 16, Road Two Alyangula	Groote Eylandt	NT	1,000	Leased	-
74	Jorn Site	Groote Eylandt	NT	898,700	Leased	-
75	Ntp 4409 (A) Pt Ntp 4391	Katherine	NT	100	Leased	-
76	NT Portion 1637, Port Keats Radar Site	Mount Goodwin	NT	56,000	Leased	-
77	Lot 1450 Arnhem Road	Nhulunbuy	NT	19,700	Leased	-
78	Jorn Site	Nhulunbuy	NT	28,655	Leased	-
79	10 Tilston Avenue	Palmerston	NT	732	Leased	-
80	Close Training Area, Thorngate Road	Palmerston	NT	9,738,232	Leased	-
81	Close Training Area, Thorngate Road	Palmerston	NT	1,942,500	Leased	-
82	Lot 495	Port Keats	NT	2,500	Leased	-
83	Lease 2078, Bradshaw Station	Timber Creek	NT	8,710,000	Leased	-
84	Mayat Aboriginal Land Trust, Victoria Highway	Timber Creek	NT	8,142	Leased	-
85	Air Training Corps Depot, Archerfield Airport	Archerfield	QLD	2,137	Leased	-
86	Rifle Range	Atherton	QLD	2,476,764	Leased	-
87	Lot 7 On 5053	Bamaga	QLD	43,290	Leased	-
88	Off Hervey Road	Ben Lomond	QLD	2,500	Leased	-
89	Army Reserve Depot, Aradurad Rd & Turpentine St	Blackwater	QLD	7,190	Leased	-
90	Lot 4 on Training Ship 159	Boigu Island	QLD	792	Leased	-
91	Army Wharf Land Apollo Road	Bulimba	QLD	2,600	Leased	-
92	Wills Development Road 51 FNQR Depot	Burketown	QLD	1,012	Leased	-
93	Building 15 General Aviation Bush Pilot Drive	Cairns	QLD	924	Leased	-
94	HMAS Cairns Naval Base Harbour Maintenance Agrmnt (1)	Cairns	QLD	35,749	Leased	-
95	'Swallows Landing' Boat Ramp Smiths Creek	Cairns	QLD	672	Leased	-
96	Access Jetty Trinity Inlet	Cairns	QLD	4,063	Leased	-

No.	Land Holding	City	State	Size (m2)	Leased / Owned	Latest Valuation of Land
97	Wharf No. 12 Trinity Inlet	Cairns	QLD	3,780	Leased	-
98	Caloundra Aerodrome 21 Pathfinder Drive Lease K on SP253854	Caloundra West	QLD	4,000	Leased	-
99	Land Warfare Centre	Canungra	QLD	-	Leased	-
100	Charters Towers Airport 1-13 Macpherson Street	Charters Towers	QLD	5,980	Leased	-
101	Air Training Corps, Browne & Clewley Streets	Corinda	QLD	700	Leased	-
102	Nw Side Of Garbutt RAAF Base, Ingham Road	Garbutt	QLD	1,565,000	Leased	-
103	Ils Site, Huth Road	Glamorganvale	QLD	101	Leased	-
104	Bombing Range	Halifax Bay	QLD	2,678,700	Leased	-
105	Field Training Area, Sharpes Road	Hervey Range	QLD	127,480	Leased	-
106	Part of State Forest, Townsville Field Training Area 4	Hervey Range	QLD	273,000,000	Leased	-
107	Jorn Site	Horn Island	QLD	14,691	Leased	-
108	Army Reserve Depot Park And Ernest Streets	Innisfail	QLD	3,035	Leased	-
109	Lot 19, Chapman Road	Kowanyama	QLD	5,880	Leased	-
110	Gatton Agricultural College	Lawes	QLD	7,655	Leased	-
111	Jetty	Lucinda	QLD	16	Leased	-
112	Lot 456	Magnetic Island	QLD	25	Leased	-
113	Radar Site, Many Peaks	Many Peaks	QLD	642,000	Leased	-
114	Site 5022 Mount Isa Airport Barkley Highway	Mount Isa	QLD	1,315	Leased	-
115	Repeater Station	Mt Glorious	QLD	-	Leased	-
116	14-18 Ryan Road	Mt Isa	QLD	2,302	Leased	-
117	Barkly Highway	Mt Isa	QLD	3,415,668	Leased	-
118	Repeater Station Site	Mt Mowbulln	QLD	-	Leased	-
119	Wyangapinni Road	Mt Parker	QLD	10	Leased	-
120	Mt Stuart Rd, Mt Stuart	Mt Stuart	QLD	100,000	Leased	-
121	Radar Station Site	Mt Tabletop	QLD	1,506	Leased	-
122	Tarrakan House Ogg Road	Murrumba Downs	QLD	50	Leased	-
123	Jorn Site	Normanton	QLD	14,691	Leased	-
124	Lot 5, Kirranth Street	Pormpuraaw	QLD	819	Leased	-
125	2 Cook Sreet - Lot 485	Portsmith	QLD	61,510	Leased	-
126	Explosives Depot Lot 146 Munitions Storage	Queerah	QLD	10,000	Leased	-
127	Explosives Depot Lot 140	Queerah	QLD	-	Leased	-
128	Explosives Depot Lot 151 Swallows Landing	Queerah	QLD	-	Leased	-

No.	Land Holding	City	State	Size (m2)	Leased / Owned	Latest Valuation of Land
129	Explosives Depot Lot 146 Access Route	Queerah	QLD	-	Leased	-
130	Air Reserve Training Depot, Nathan Road	Rothwell	QLD	8,802	Leased	-
131	Airport	Rockhampton	QLD	9,000	Leased	-
132	Archer & Huberts Streets	South Townsville	QLD	1,848	Leased	-
133	Naval Berthing Facility	Thursday Island	QLD	749	Leased	-
134	Greenvale Railway Line, Townsville Field Training Area	Townsville	QLD	1,133,510	Leased	-
135	Lot 2 SP105871 & Lot 603 SP251244	Townsville	QLD	7,060	Leased	-
136	Berth 10	Townsville Port	QLD	-	Leased	-
137	Tropical Trials Area Mcnamee & Liverpool Creeks	Tully	QLD	25,900,000	Leased	-
138	Army Tropical Trials Area, Downey Creek	Tully	QLD	33,994,800	Leased	-
139	Army Tropical Trials Area, Jarra Creek	Tully	QLD	5,870,000	Leased	-
140	Rifle Range	Wangetti	QLD	-	Leased	-
141	Lot 1000 Mp37180, Kerr Point Drive	Weipa	QLD	29,230	Leased	-
142	RAAF Base, Scherger	Weipa	QLD	-	Leased	-
143	RAAF Base, Scherger	Weipa	QLD	38,500,000	Leased	-
144	RAAF Base, Scherger	Weipa	QLD	46,040,000	Leased	-
145	2-34 Badgen Road	Wellington Point	QLD	144	Leased	-
146	Gawler Reach	Birkenhead	SA	-	Leased	-
147	Lot 12 Summit Road	Crafers	SA	-	Leased	-
148	Portion Of Sect 123 & 124, Hundred Of Jenkins-Cultana Army	Cultana	SA	-	Leased	-
149	RAAF Base Edinburgh West Avenue	Edinburgh	SA	-	Leased	-
150	South East Gate 9 Purling Ave	Edinburgh	SA	312	Leased	-
151	86-120 Purling Ave	Edinburgh Parks	SA	159,260	Leased	-
152	Pt Sec 86 Boundary Road	Gawler River	SA	100	Leased	-
153	Anzac Highway	Keswick	SA	2,180	Leased	-
154	Lot 201, Dyson Road	Lonsdale	SA	1,072	Leased	-
155	Mount Gambier Airport	Mount Gambier	SA	-	Leased	-
156	O'Halloran Terrace	Mount Gambier	SA	-	Leased	-
157	Section 241 355 Hundred, Woolundunga	Mt Brown	SA	-	Leased	-
158	Sec 323 Hundred Woolundunga	Mt Brown	SA	-	Leased	-
159	Corner Bowhill & Karoonada Road	Murray Bridge	SA	700	Leased	-
160	Murray Bridge Training Area Karoonda Road	Murray Bridge	SA	-	Leased	-

No.	Land Holding	City	State	Size (m2)	Leased / Owned	Latest Valuation of Land
161	Pt Lot 305 Heaslip Road	Penfield	SA	100	Leased	-
162	Burgoyne Street	Port Augusta	SA	3,250	Leased	-
163	Hannagan Street	Port Augusta	SA	250	Leased	-
164	Thistle Island	Port Lincoln	SA	-	Leased	-
165	Brougham Place	Port Lincoln	SA	-	Leased	-
166	Fowler Terrace Salt Works	Price	SA	2,105	Leased	-
167	6-12 School Lynton Terrace	Seaford	SA	-	Leased	-
168	Ridge Rd	Summertown	SA	-	Leased	-
169	Lot 8 Commerce Crescent	Victor Harbor	SA	1,100	Leased	-
170	Yaringa MUD Carpark	Whyalla	SA	-	Leased	-
171	Yaringa MUD	Whyalla	SA	-	Leased	-
172	93 Mile Tank Arcoona Station	Woomera	SA	200	Leased	-
173	Kootaberra Station (off Stuart Highway)	Woomera	SA	200	Leased	-
174	Foreshore, Stony Head Military Area	Beechford	TAS	150,000	Leased	-
175	Beechford	Beechford	TAS	1,500	Leased	-
176	82 Cove Hill Rd	Bridgewater	TAS	714	Leased	-
177	Training Area	Buckland	TAS	205,720,000	Leased	-
178	'A' Road	Buckland	TAS	-	Leased	-
179	'A' Road	Buckland	TAS	-	Leased	-
180	Sand River Road	Buckland	TAS	37,600	Leased	-
181	Training Area	Buckland	TAS	1,300	Leased	-
182	Ambleside, River Road	Devonport	TAS	-	Leased	-
183	HMAS Huon, Queens Domain	Hobart	TAS	404	Leased	-
184	HMAS Huon, Queens Domain	Hobart	TAS	6	Leased	-
185	Boat Ramp HMAS Huon	Hobart	TAS	41	Leased	-
186	Lots 1 & 2 Buffer Zone off Shene Road	Pontville	TAS	-	Leased	-
187	Lot 3 Buffer Zone off Merriworth Road	Pontville	TAS	15,128	Leased	-
188	117 Tully Street	St Helens	TAS	538	Leased	-
189	Ulverstone Community Precinct Building Ulverstone Show Ground	West Ulverstone	TAS	-	Leased	-
190	Off Bass Highway	Wivenhoe	TAS	4,450	Leased	-
191	Murray Valley Hwy	Bandiana	VIC	-	Leased	-
192	Rail Line, Murray Valley Highway	Bandiana	VIC	839	Leased	-

No.	Land Holding	City	State	Size (m2)	Leased / Owned	Latest Valuation of Land
193	Murray Valley Hwy	Bandiana	VIC	-	Leased	-
194	Murray Valley Hwy	Bandiana	VIC	-	Leased	-
195	Murray Valley Hwy	Bandiana	VIC	-	Leased	-
196	Cnr Arundel & Bridge Streets	Benalla	VIC	389	Leased	-
197	180 McIntosh Road	Bonegilla	VIC	362	Leased	-
198	Cooper Street	Epping	VIC	20,000	Leased	-
199	Cadet Training Facility Robinsons Rd Robinsons Road	Frankston	VIC	1,846	Leased	-
200	54-70 Western Beach Foreshore	Geelong	VIC	682	Leased	-
201	RS 5124 Sturt Highway	Lake Cullulleraine	VIC	798	Leased	-
202	Railway Reserve off Kidbrooke Road	Laverton	VIC	-	Leased	-
203	Railway Reserve off Kidbrooke Road	Laverton	VIC	434	Leased	-
204	Air Force Cadets, Cnr Twelfth St & San Mateo Ave	Mildura	VIC	-	Leased	-
205	Off Airfield Road	Morwell	VIC	1,870	Leased	-
206	Off Northwood Road	Northwood	VIC	105,000	Leased	-
207	East of Milgate Street	Oakleigh	VIC	-	Leased	-
208	Access Road To PWEA, 29 Mile Rd	Point Wilson	VIC	2,085	Leased	-
209	Seabed next to Point Wilson Wharf	Point Wilson	VIC	1,861,556	Leased	-
210	506 Lorimer Street	Port Melbourne	VIC	19	Leased	-
211	Navy Cadets Training Depot Lee Breakwater Road	Portland	VIC	940	Leased	-
212	Reserved Forest off Heathcote-Nagambie	Puckapunyal	VIC	545,910	Leased	-
213	124-126 Cunninghame Street	Sale	VIC	-	Leased	-
214	SES Site, Sloane Street	Stawell	VIC	-	Leased	-
215	Murray Valley Hwy	Tallangatta Rail	VIC	-	Leased	-
216	146 Nelson Place (Boatshed, Slipway & Jetty)	Williamstown	VIC	2,037	Leased	-
217	60 Nelson Place	Williamstown	VIC	3,735	Leased	-
218	Reserve 46106 Jorn Site	Broome	WA	-	Leased	-
219	Lot 501 Clementson St	Broome	WA	2,709	Leased	-
220	Obstruction Light 3 & Access, Part Lot 8	Bullsbrook	WA	37	Leased	-
221	Cnr Hutton & Coolilup Roads	Capel	WA	1,480,000	Leased	-
222	Ntl Aust Broadcasting Site, Brown Range N-W Coastal Hwy	Carnarvon	WA	14,198	Leased	-
223	Christmas Island Airport	Christmas Island	WA	-	Leased	-
224	Lot 33, West Island	Cocos (Keeling)	WA	185,000	Leased	-

No.	Land Holding	City	State	Size (m2)	Leased / Owned	Latest Valuation of Land
225	Part Loc 345, West Island	Cocos Island	WA	600	Leased	-
226	Dampier Port	Dampier	WA	-	Leased	-
227	Riverside & Wauhop Roads	East Fremantle	WA	14,255	Leased	-
228	Training Ship 'Perth', Riverside Road	East Fremantle	WA	1,707	Leased	-
229	Lot 5, Bandy Creek Boat Harbour	Esperance	WA	2,000	Leased	-
230	Swan Location 12778 & 12779, Eclipse Hill	Gingin	WA	625	Leased	-
231	Wannamal Road	Gingin	WA	100	Leased	-
232	Brand Highway	Gingin	WA	100	Leased	-
233	124 Quill Way	Henderson	WA	-	Leased	-
234	Cinders Road	Karratha	WA	-	Leased	-
235	Victoria Highway	Kununurra	WA	16,000	Leased	-
236	Air Safety Marker (South), Pt Melbourne Location 3914	Lancelin	WA	-	Leased	-
237	Naval/Army Gunnery Range, Melbourne Location 4229	Lancelin	WA	11,834	Leased	-
238	Reserve No 28058, Kingsway Sporting Complex	Madeley	WA	6,586	Leased	-
239	Bombing Range, Reserve C 425	Muchea	WA	10,090	Leased	-
240	Swan Location 1352, Muchea East Road	Muchea	WA	300	Leased	-
241	Shota Road	Port Hedland	WA	30,000	Leased	-
242	Servetus Street	Swanbourne	WA	18	Leased	-
243	Swan Location 1 Lot 63 Copley Road (Near GNH)	Upper Swan	WA	-	Leased	-
244	Albion Park Rail	Albion Park	NSW	250	Leased	-
245	BA Tower	Mt Dowe	NSW	-	Leased	-
246	Shoalwater Bay Training Area	Rockhampton	QLD	-	Leased	-
247	Cultana - Pastoral Land	Cultana	SA	-	Leased	-
248	Katunga Pastoral Land PE2283	Cultana	SA	122	Leased	-
249	Lincoln Park Pastoral Land PE2366	Cultana	SA	-	Leased	-
250	71-73 Bamford Lane	Townsville	QLD	3,654	Leased	-

No.	Land Holding	Suburb	State	(3) Assets (Buildings, facilities or other)	(3a) Occupancy Level (%)	(3a) Occupant
1	24 - 28 Fairbairn Avenue	Canberra Airport	ACT	Communications duct.	100	E&IG
2	Canberra Airport Cabling Licence	Canberra Airport	ACT	Airside Cable license.	100	E&IG
3	Naval Wharf Facilities, Bindijine Beach Beecroft Pen.	Jervis Bay	ACT	Wharf.	100	Navy
4	HMAS Creswell Seabed Land Below Mhwm	Jervis Bay	ACT	Seabed license.	100	Navy
5	141 Flemington Road	Mitchell	ACT	Carpark.	100	CIOG
6	Brindabella Range	Mt Ginini	ACT	Repeater station.	100	RAAF
7	Air Force Cadet (412 Sqn) Cnr Dalton Place & Avalon Street	Albury Airport	NSW	Training facility.	100	RAAF
8	Off Sport UNE Drive University of New England	Armidale	NSW	Training facility.	100	Army
9	HMAS Penguin, Middle Head Road	Balmoral	NSW	Jetty, berths, slipway.	100	Navy
10	Bathurst Regional Airport Melrose Drive	Bathurst	NSW	Airport facilities.	100	RAAF
11	1-3 Windsock Way Bathurst Airport	Bathurst	NSW	Training facility.	100	RAAF
12	Botany Road & Hill Street	Botany	NSW	Storm water drain.	100	Army
13	Site 754, Camden Airport	Camden	NSW	Airport facilities.	100	RAAF
14	Site 754, Camden Airport	Camden	NSW	Marching license.	100	RAAF
15	Part Coffs Jetty, Foreshore Reserve	Coffs Harbour	NSW	Training facility.	100	Navy
16	119 Fitzroy Street	Cowra	NSW	Training facility.	100	Army
17	Rifle Range, Orara West State Forest No 535	Dairyville	NSW	Rifle range.	100	Army
18	Spectacle Island	Drummoyne	NSW	Wharf.	100	Navy
19	Spectacle Island	Drummoyne	NSW	Submarine pipeline.	100	Navy
20	Spectacle Island	Drummoyne	NSW	Watermain.	100	Navy
21	Off St George's Crescent	Drummoyne	NSW	Jetty.	100	Navy
22	Part of the Seabed Twofold Bay	Eden	NSW	Wharf.	100	Navy
23	Bombing & Gunnery Range	Evans Head	NSW	Bombing range.	100	RAAF
24	Rifle & Bombing Ranges	Evans Head	NSW	Bombing range.	100	RAAF
25	HMAS Kuttabul	Garden Island	NSW	Workshop facilities.	100	Navy
26	Port Jackson Sydney	Garden Island	NSW	Wharf.	100	Navy
27	Chowder Bay Road	Georges Heights	NSW	Wharf.	100	Navy
28	Ts Hawkesbury, Point Clare	Gosford	NSW	Training facility.	100	Navy
29	Theodolite Site	Hyams Beach	NSW	Theodolite site.	100	Navy
30	Repeater Station Site	Kings Tableland	NSW	Repeater station.	100	RAAF
31	Northcliff Drive	Lake Illawarra	NSW	Training facility.	100	Navy and RAAF

No.	Land Holding	Suburb	State	(3) Assets (Buildings, facilities or other)	(3a) Occupancy Level (%)	(3a) Occupant
32	Northcliff Drive	Lake Illawarra	NSW	Access road.	100	Navy
33	Parachute Dropping Zone	Londonderry	NSW	Parachute zone.	100	RAAF
34	Newnes State Forest No748	Marrangaroo	NSW	Explosive safety zone.	100	Army
35	Buckingbong State Forest No156	Morundah	NSW	Buffer zone.	100	CASG
36	Mount Heaton Repeater Station site, Freemans Hole Road	Mount Heaton	NSW	Repeater station.	100	RAAF
37	Brunkerville Freeman's Road	Mount Heaton	NSW	Communication facilities.	100	RAAF
38	Obstruction Lights - Mt Jerrabomberra	Mount	NSW	Obstruction lights.	100	RAAF
39	Licence over Roadway	Mulwala	NSW	Roadway Access.	100	CASG
40	Yarrawonga to Oaklands Rail Line	Mulwala	NSW	Water pipe.	100	CASG
41	Army Base	Myambat	NSW	Water pipe.	100	Army
42	HMAS Platypus Adderson Ave	Neutral Bay	NSW	Wharf.	100	Navy
43	HMAS Platypus Adderson Ave	Neutral Bay	NSW	Crossing cables.	100	Navy
44	180 Hanckel Rd	Oakville	NSW	Instrument Landing System.	100	RAAF
45	Repeater Station Site	Point Lookout	NSW	Repeater station.	100	RAAF
46	Raymond Terrace Instrument Landing Site	Raymond Terrace	NSW	Instrument Landing System.	100	RAAF
47	TS Culgoa	South West Rocks	NSW	Training facility.	100	Navy
48	Building Lot 23, Tamworth Airport	Tamworth	NSW	Training facility.	100	RAAF
49	Parade Ground, Tamworth Airport	Tamworth	NSW	Parade ground.	100	RAAF
50	ILS Site, Comerong Island Road	Terara	NSW	Instrument Landing System.	100	Navy
51	Naval Reserve T S Vampire Dry Rock Road TS Vampire Dry Rock Road	Terranora	NSW	Parade ground.	100	Navy
52	RAAF Aerodrome, Forest Hill	Wagga Wagga	NSW	Pipeline.	100	RAAF
53	RAAF Aerodrome, Forest Hill	Wagga Wagga	NSW	Pipeline.	100	RAAF
54	RAAF Aerodrome, Forest Hill	Wagga Wagga	NSW	Pipeline.	100	RAAF
55	RAAF Aerodrome, Forest Hill	Wagga Wagga	NSW	Pipeline.	100	RAAF
56	Kapooka Enclosure Permit 56136	Wagga Wagga	NSW	Access road.	100	Army
57	Kapooka Enclosure Permit 56690	Wagga Wagga	NSW	Access road.	100	Army
58	Cliff Street	Watsons Bay	NSW	Sub cables.	100	Navy
59	Shark Island Shark Point	Watsons Bay	NSW	Degaussing range.	100	Navy
60	HMAS Waterhen-Naval Base Land, Balls Head	Waverton	NSW	Seabed license.	100	Navy
61	HMAS Waterhen-Naval Base Land, Balls Head	Waverton	NSW	Land.	100	Navy
62	Parachute Dropping Zone	Williamstown	NSW	Parachute drop zone.	100	Army
63	Parachute Dropping Zone	Williamstown	NSW	Parachute drop zone.	100	Army
64	Franki Ave & Margaret Street	Woolwich	NSW	Seabed license.	100	Navy
65	Pt. Lot 3939, Airport	Alice Springs	NT	Airport facilities.	100	JORN

No.	Land Holding	Suburb	State	(3) Assets (Buildings, facilities or other)	(3a) Occupancy Level (%)	(3a) Occupant
66	Lot 2423 Butler Road	Alice Springs	NT	Shooting complex.	100	Army
67	Norforce Depot, Town Gymnasium	Bathurst Island	NT	Depot site.	100	Army
68	Point Fawcett Bathurst Island	Bathurst Island	NT	Radar facility.	100	RAAF
69	Lot 820 (A), Norforce Depot Garawa Street	Borrooloola	NT	Depot site.	100	Army
70	Air Traffic Control Building, Darwin Airport	Darwin	NT	Airport facilities.	100	RAAF
71	Lot 7248 Waterfront Precinct	Darwin	NT	Berthing facility.	100	Navy
72	Delamere Range Facility Buntine Highway	Delamere	NT	Range facility.	100	RAAF
73	Part Lot 141, Koorunga Street	Elliott	NT	ionospheric site.	100	DSTG
74	Lot 16, Road Two Alyangula	Groote Eylandt	NT	Depot site.	100	Army
75	Jorn Site	Groote Eylandt	NT	Radar facility.	100	RAAF
76	Ntp 4409 (A) Pt Ntp 4391	Katherine	NT	Instrument Landing System.	100	RAAF
77	NT Portion 1637, Port Keats Radar Site	Mount Goodwin	NT	Radar facility.	100	RAAF
78	Lot 1450 Arnhem Road	Nhulunbuy	NT	Depot site.	100	Army
79	Jorn Site	Nhulunbuy	NT	Radar facility.	100	RAAF
80	10 Tilston Avenue	Palmerston	NT	Training facility.	100	RAAF
81	Close Training Area, Thorngate Road	Palmerston	NT	Training area.	100	Army
82	Close Training Area, Thorngate Road	Palmerston	NT	Training area.	100	Army
83	Lot 495	Port Keats	NT	Depot site.	100	Army
84	Lease 2078, Bradshaw Station	Timber Creek	NT	Training area.	100	Army
85	Mayat Aboriginal Land Trust, Victoria Highway	Timber Creek	NT	Radar facility.	100	RAAF
86	Air Training Corps Depot, Archerfield Airport	Archerfield	QLD	Training facility.	100	RAAF
87	Rifle Range	Atherton	QLD	Rifle range.	100	Army
88	Lot 7 On 5053	Bamaga	QLD	Training depot.	100	Army
89	Off Hervey Road	Ben Lomond	QLD	Radio tower.	100	Army
90	Army Reserve Depot, Aradurad Rd & Turpentine St	Blackwater	QLD	Depot site.	100	Army
91	Lot 4 on Training Ship 159	Boigu Island	QLD	Training facility.	100	Army
92	Army Wharf Land Apollo Road	Bulimba	QLD	Wharf facilities.	100	Army
93	Wills Development Road 51 FNQR Depot	Burketown	QLD	Storage facilities.	100	Army
94	Building 15 General Aviation Bush Pilot Drive	Cairns	QLD	Airport facilities.	100	RAAF
95	HMAS Cairns Naval Base Harbour Maintenance Agrmnt (1)	Cairns	QLD	Maintenance repair.	100	Navy
96	'Swallows Landing' Boat Ramp Smiths Creek	Cairns	QLD	Boat ramp.	100	Navy
97	Access Jetty Trinity Inlet	Cairns	QLD	Jetty access.	100	Navy
98	Wharf No. 12 Trinity Inlet	Cairns	QLD	Wharf access.	100	Navy
99	Caloundra Aerodrome 21 Pathfinder Drive Lease K on SP253854	Caloundra West	QLD	Training facility.	100	RAAF

No.	Land Holding	Suburb	State	(3) Assets (Buildings, facilities or other)	(3a) Occupancy Level (%)	(3a) Occupant
100	Land Warfare Centre	Canungra	QLD	Water tower permit.	100	E&IG
101	Charters Towers Airport 1-13 Macpherson Street	Charters Towers	QLD	Training facility.	100	RAAF
102	Air Training Corps, Browne & Clewley Streets	Corinda	QLD	Training facility.	100	RAAF
103	Unit B, Lot 10 Hawkins Place	Emerald	QLD	Training depot.	100	Army
104	Nw Side Of Garbutt RAAF Base, Ingham Road	Garbutt	QLD	Land.	100	RAAF
105	Ilis Site, Huth Road	Glamorganvale	QLD	Instrument Landing System.	100	RAAF
106	Bombing Range	Halifax Bay	QLD	Bombing range.	100	RAAF
107	Field Training Area, Sharpes Road	Hervey Range	QLD	Access road.	100	Army
108	Part of State Forest, Townsville Field Training Area 4	Hervey Range	QLD	Training area.	100	Army
109	Jorn Site	Horn Island	QLD	Radar facility.	100	CASG
110	Army Reserve Depot Park And Ernest Streets	Innisfail	QLD	Army reserve depot.	100	Army
111	Lot 19, Chapman Road	Kowanyama	QLD	Depot site.	100	Army
112	Gatton Agricultural College	Lawes	QLD	Training facility.	100	Army
113	Jetty	Lucinda	QLD	Weather station.	100	DSTG
114	Lot 456	Magnetic Island	QLD	Obstruction beacon.	100	RAAF
115	Radar Site, Many Peaks	Many Peaks	QLD	Radar facility.	100	RAAF
116	Site 5022 Mount Isa Airport Barkley Highway	Mount Isa	QLD	Training facility.	100	RAAF
117	Repeater Station	Mt Glorious	QLD	Repeater station.	100	RAAF
118	14-18 Ryan Road	Mt Isa	QLD	Army reserve depot.	100	Army
119	Barkly Highway	Mt Isa	QLD	Rifle range.	100	Army
120	Repeater Station Site	Mt Mowbullian	QLD	Repeater station.	100	RAAF
121	Wyangapinni Road	Mt Parker	QLD	Navigation facilities.	100	Army
122	Mt Stuart Rd, Mt Stuart	Mt Stuart	QLD	Training area.	100	Army
123	Radar Station Site	Mt Tabletop	QLD	Radar facility.	100	RAAF
124	Tarrakan House Ogg Road	Murrumba Downs	QLD	Training facility.	100	Army
125	Jorn Site	Normanton	QLD	Radar facility.	100	CASG
126	Lot 5, Kirranth Street	Pormpuraaw	QLD	Depot site.	100	Army
127	2 Cook Street	Portsmith	QLD	Training facility.	100	Navy
128	DSTG Facility Moggil Road CSIRO	Pullenvale	QLD	Defence Science and Technology Office facilities.	100	DSTG
129	DSTG Facility Moggil Road CSIRO	Pullenvale	QLD	Defence Science and Technology Office facilities.	100	DSTG
130	Explosives Depot Lot 146 Munitions Storage	Queerah	QLD	Explosives depot.	100	Navy
131	Explosives Depot Lot 140	Queerah	QLD	Road access.	100	Navy
132	Explosives Depot Lot 151 Swallows Landing	Queerah	QLD	Road access.	100	Navy
133	Explosives Depot Lot 146 Access Route	Queerah	QLD	Road access.	100	Navy

No.	Land Holding	Suburb	State	(3) Assets (Buildings, facilities or other)	(3a) Occupancy Level (%)	(3a) Occupant
134	Air Reserve Training Depot, Nathan Road	Redcliffe	QLD	Training depot.	100	RAAF
135	Airport	Rockhampton	QLD	Airport facilities.	100	RAAF
136	Lot 601	South Townsville	QLD	Seabed license.	100	Army
137	Archer & Huberts Streets	South Townsville	QLD	Training facility.	100	Navy
138	Naval Berthing Facility	Thursday Island	QLD	Berthing facility.	100	Navy
139	Greenvale Railway Line, Townsville Field Training Area	Townsville	QLD	Rail transfer corridor.	100	Army
140	Lot A in Lot 601 on SP137141	Townsville	QLD	Ten force support.	100	Army
141	Lot 2 on SP105871 Ross River	Townsville	QLD	Seabed license.	100	Army
142	Berth 10	Townsville Port	QLD	Berthing facility.	100	Army
143	Tropical Trials Area Mcnamee & Liverpool Creeks	Tully	QLD	Training facility.	100	Army
144	Army Tropical Trials Area, Downey Creek	Tully	QLD	Training facility.	100	Army
145	Army Tropical Trials Area, Jarra Creek	Tully	QLD	Training facility.	100	Army
146	Rifle Range	Wangetti	QLD	Rifle range.	100	Army
147	Lot 1000 Mp37180, Kerr Point Drive	Weipa	QLD	Storage depot.	100	Army
148	RAAF Base, Scherger	Weipa	QLD	Land.	100	RAAF
149	RAAF Base, Scherger	Weipa	QLD	Road access.	100	RAAF
150	RAAF Base, Scherger	Weipa	QLD	Buffer zone.	100	RAAF
151	2-34 Badgen Road	Wellington Point	QLD	Training facility.	100	Navy
152	Gawler Reach	Birkenhead	SA	Training facility.	100	Navy
153	Lot 12 Summit Road	Crafers	SA	Antenna site.	100	RAAF
154	Portion Of Sect 123 & 124, Hundred Of Jenkins-Cultana Army	Cultana	SA	Training area.	100	Army
155	RAAF Base Edinburgh West Avenue	Edinburgh	SA	Modular accommodation.	100	RAAF
156	South East Gate 9 Purling Ave	Edinburgh	SA	Emergency exit route.	100	DSTG
157	86-120 Purling Ave	Edinburgh Parks	SA	Land access.	100	E&IG
158	Pt Sec 86 Boundary Road	Gawler River	SA	Outer beacon site.	100	RAAF
159	Anzac Highway	Keswick	SA	Service road.	100	E&IG
160	Lot 201, Dyson Road	Lonsdale	SA	Depot site.	100	Army
161	Mount Gambier Airport	Mount Gambier	SA	Training facility.	100	RAAF
162	O'Halloran Terrace	Mount Gambier	SA	Training facility.	100	Navy
163	Section 241 355 Hundred, Woolundunga	Mt Brown	SA	Repeater station.	100	Army
164	Sec 323 Hundred Woolundunga	Mt Brown	SA	Repeater access road.	100	Army
165	Corner Bowhill & Karoonada Road	Murray Bridge	SA	Water pipe.	100	Army
166	Murray Bridge Training Area Karoonda Road	Murray Bridge	SA	Water pipe.	100	E&IG
167	Pt Lot 305 Heaslip Road	Penfield	SA	Middle beacon site.	100	RAAF

No.	Land Holding	Suburb	State	(3) Assets (Buildings, facilities or other)	(3a) Occupancy Level (%)	(3a) Occupant
168	Burgoyne Street	Port Augusta	SA	Training facility.	100	Navy
169	Hannagan Street	Port Augusta	SA	Training facility.	100	Army
170	Thistle Island	Port Lincoln	SA	Range.	100	Navy
171	Brougham Place	Port Lincoln	SA	Training facility.	100	Navy
172	Fowler Terrace Salt Works	Price	SA	Ratio trail site.	100	DSTG
173	6-12 School Lynton Terrace	Seaford	SA	Training facility.	100	RAAF
174	Ridge Rd	Summertown	SA	Repeater station.	100	RAAF
175	Lot 8 Commerce Crescent	Victor Harbor	SA	Training facility.	100	Army
176	Yaringa MUD Carpark	Whyalla	SA	Carpark.	100	Army
177	Yaringa MUD	Whyalla	SA	Depot site.	100	Army
178	93 Mile Tank Arcoona Station	Woomera	SA	Land.	100	E&IG
179	Kootaberra Station (off Stuart Highway)	Woomera	SA	Land.	100	E&IG
180	Foreshore, Stoney Head Military Area	Beechford	TAS	Training facility.	100	Army
181	Beechford	Beechford	TAS	Roadway Access.	100	Army
182	82 Cove Hill Rd	Bridgewater	TAS	Training facility.	100	Army
183	Training Area	Buckland	TAS	Training area.	100	Army
184	Training Area	Buckland	TAS	Training area.	100	Army
185	'A' Road	Buckland	TAS	Access road.	100	Army
186	Training Area	Buckland	TAS	Access road.	100	Army
187	'A' Road	Buckland	TAS	Access road.	100	Army
188	Ambleside, River Road	Devonport	TAS	Training facility.	100	Navy
189	HMAS Huon, Queens Domain	Hobart	TAS	Boatshed, boat ramp.	100	Navy
190	HMAS Huon, Queens Domain	Hobart	TAS	Storage facilities.	100	Navy
191	Boat Ramp HMAS Huon	Hobart	TAS	Boat ramp.	100	Navy
192	Lots 1 & 2 Buffer Zone	Pontville	TAS	Buffer zone.	100	Army
193	Lot 3 Buffer Zone	Pontville	TAS	Buffer zone.	100	Army
194	117 Tully Street	St Helens	TAS	Training facility.	100	Navy
195	Ulverstone Community Precinct Building Ulverstone Show Ground Fora	West Ulverstone	TAS	Training facility.	100	Navy
196	Off Bass Highway	Wivenhoe	TAS	Training facility.	100	Navy
197	Murray Valley Hwy	Bandiana	VIC	Sewer pipe.	100	Army
198	Rail Line, Murray Valley Highway	Bandiana	VIC	Water pipe.	100	Army
199	Murray Valley Hwy	Bandiana	VIC	Water pipe.	100	Army
200	Murray Valley Hwy	Bandiana	VIC	Sewer pipe.	100	Army
201	Murray Valley Hwy	Bandiana	VIC	Watermain.	100	Army

No.	Land Holding	Suburb	State	(3) Assets (Buildings, facilities or other)	(3a) Occupancy Level (%)	(3a) Occupant
202	Cnr Arundel & Bridge Streets	Benalla	VIC	Training facility.	100	RAAF
203	180 McIntosh Road	Bonegilla	VIC	Sewage Pipe.	100	Army
204	Cooper Street	Epping	VIC	Underwater explosives test facility.	100	DSTG
205	Army Cadets Training Depot, Robinsons Rd	Frankston	VIC	Training facility.	100	Army
206	54-70 Western Beach Foreshore	Geelong	VIC	Training facility.	100	Navy
207	RS 5124 Sturt Highway	Lake Cullulleraine	VIC	Training facility.	100	Navy
208	Railway Reserve off Kidbrooke Road	Laverton	VIC	Underline drain	100	RAAF
209	Railway Reserve off Kidbrooke Road	Laverton	VIC	Groundwater bores.	100	RAAF
210	Air Force Cadets, Cnr Twelfth St & San Mateo Ave	Mildura	VIC	Training facility.	100	RAAF
211	Air Force Cadets, Cnr Twelfth St & San Mateo Ave	Mildura	VIC	Training facility.	100	RAAF
212	Off Airfield Road	Morwell	VIC	Training facility.	100	RAAF
213	Off Northwood Road	Northwood	VIC	Road access.	100	Army
214	East of Milgate Street	Oakleigh	VIC	Drain.	100	E&IG
215	Access Road To PWEA, 29 Mile Rd	Point Wilson	VIC	Explosive area.	100	CASG
216	Seabed next to Point Wilson Wharf	Point Wilson	VIC	Explosive area.	100	CASG
217	506 Lorimer Street	Port Melbourne	VIC	Water drain.	100	DSTG
218	Navy Cadets Training Depot Lee Breakwater Road	Portland	VIC	Training Facility.	100	Navy
219	Reserved Forest off Heathcote-Nagambie	Puckapunyal	VIC	Buffer zone.	100	Army
220	124-126 Cunninghame Street	Sale	VIC	Radio mast / equipment.	100	RAAF
221	SES Site, Sloane Street	Stawell	VIC	Training facility.	100	Army
222	Murray Valley Hwy	Tallangatta Rail	VIC	Land.	100	Army
223	146 Nelson Place (Boatshed, Slipway & Jetty)	Williamstown	VIC	Boatshed, slipway, jetty.	100	Navy
224	60 Nelson Place	Williamstown	VIC	Project office.	100	CASG
225	Reserve 46106 Jorn Site	Broome	WA	Radar facility.	100	RAAF
226	Lot 501 Clementson St	Broome	WA	Training facility.	100	Navy
227	Obstruction Light 3 & Access, Part Lot 8	Bullsbrook	WA	Obstruction lights.	100	RAAF
228	Cnr Hutton & Coolilup Roads	Capel	WA	Rifle range.	100	Army
229	Ntl Aust Broadcasting Site, Brown Range N-W Coastal Hwy	Carnarvon	WA	Communications facility.	100	RAAF
230	Christmas Island Airport	Christmas Island	WA	Hangar.	100	Navy
231	Lot 33, West Island	Cocos (Keeling)	WA	Communication facilities.	100	RAAF
232	Part Loc 345, West Island	Cocos Island	WA	Demountable building.	100	RAAF
233	Dampier Port	Dampier	WA	Berthing facility.	100	Navy
234	Riverside & Wauhop Roads	East Fremantle	WA	Riverbed, jetty license.	100	Navy
235	Training Ship 'Perth', Riverside Road	East Fremantle	WA	Training facility.	100	Navy

No.	Land Holding	Suburb	State	(3) Assets (Buildings, facilities or other)	(3a) Occupancy Level (%)	(3a) Occupant
236	Lot 5, Bandy Creek Boat Harbour	Esperance	WA	Training facility.	100	Navy
237	Swan Location 12778 & 12779, Eclipse Hill	Gingin	WA	Radar facility.	100	RAAF
238	Wannamal Road	Gingin	WA	Instrument Landing System.	100	RAAF
239	Brand Highway	Gingin	WA	Instrument Landing System.	100	RAAF
240	Rifle Range Reserve Victoria Location 11499 Reserve 37333	Greenough	WA	Rifle range.	100	Army
241	124 Quill Way	Henderson	WA	Wharf.	100	Navy
242	Cinders Road	Karratha	WA	Rifle range.	100	Army
243	Victoria Highway	Kununurra	WA	Radar beacon.	100	RAAF
244	Air Safety Marker (South), Pt Melbourne Location 3914	Lancelin	WA	Air safety marker.	100	Navy
245	Naval/Army Gunnery Range, Melbourne Location 4229	Lancelin	WA	Gunnery range.	100	Navy
246	Reserve No 28058, Kingsway Sporting Complex	Madeley	WA	Training facility.	100	RAAF
247	Bombing Range, Reserve C 425	Muchea	WA	Weapons range.	100	RAAF
248	Swan Location 1352, Muchea East Road	Muchea	WA	Antenna site.	100	RAAF
249	Shota Road	Port Hedland	WA	Radar facility.	100	RAAF
250	Servetus Street	Swanbourne	WA	Training depot.	100	Army
251	Swan Location 1 Lot 63 Copley Road (Near GNH)	Upper Swan	WA	Instrument Landing System.	100	RAAF

No	Name of Property	Location of the building (city, state)	Leased/Owned	Occupancy Rate (%)	If occupancy is identified as less than 100%, for what is the remaining used
Commercial Office Buildings					
1	Campbell Park	Campbell, ACT	Leased	73.7%	Vacant, allowance for churn
2	13 London Circuit	Canberra, ACT	Leased	75.0%	Vacant, allowance for churn
3	1 Molonglo Drive	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	77.6%	Vacant, allowance for churn
4	10 Richmond Avenue	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	54.5%	Vacant, allowance for churn
5	18 Brindabella Circuit	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	63.2%	Vacant, allowance for churn
6	20 Brindabella Circuit	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	95.2%	Vacant, allowance for churn
7	24 Scherger Drive F2	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	78.2%	Vacant, allowance for churn
8	25 Brindabella Circuit	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	76.9%	Fit-out works have been completed since this audit and another unit has moved in
9	26 Brindabella Circuit BP26	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	84.1%	Vacant, allowance for churn
10	26 Scherger Drive F3	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	75.8%	Vacant, allowance for churn
11	26 Richmond Avenue F1	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
12	28 Scherger Drive F4	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	74.8%	Vacant, allowance for churn
13	29 Brindabella Circuit BP29	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	83.0%	Vacant, allowance for churn
14	31 Brindabella Circuit BP31	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	88.0%	Vacant, allowance for churn
15	33 Brindabella Circuit BP33	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	80.3%	Vacant, allowance for churn
16	35 Brindabella Circuit BP35	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	79.1%	Vacant, allowance for churn
17	39 Brindabella Circuit BP39	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	22.8%	Two floors had just been vacated as at this audit, they have since been backfilled
18	109 Kent Street	Deakin, ACT	Leased	70.3%	This site is being decanted as the lease is closing
19	8 Thesiger Court	Deakin, ACT	Leased	80.4%	Vacant, allowance for churn
20	1.2 Dairy Road	Fyshwick, ACT	Leased	50.0%	Half of this site is designated staging space
21	10 Whyalla Street	Fyshwick, ACT	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
22	104 Gladstone Street	Fyshwick, ACT	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
23	105 Tennant Street	Fyshwick, ACT	Leased	55.0%	Site is predominantly training rooms with office area attached
24	107 Tennant Street	Fyshwick, ACT	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
25	5 Tennant Street	Fyshwick, ACT	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
26	Building 5 101 Tennant Street	Fyshwick, ACT	Leased	65.4%	Site is predominantly training rooms with office area attached
27	101 Flemington Road	Mitchell, ACT	Leased	78.5%	Vacant, allowance for churn
28	Anzac Park West	Reid, ACT	Leased	87.9%	Vacant, allowance for churn
29	Building R1, Sir Thomas Blamey Square	Russell, ACT	Owned	85.8%	Vacant, allowance for churn
30	Building R2, Sir Thomas Blamey Square	Russell, ACT	Owned	73.6%	Vacant, allowance for churn
31	Building R3, Sir Thomas Blamey Square	Russell, ACT	Owned	86.1%	Vacant, allowance for churn
32	Building R8, Sir Thomas Blamey Square	Russell, ACT	Owned	62.6%	Defence is undertaking significant re-fitout works at this site
33	Level 4 Building R9 Russell Offices Russell Drive	Russell, ACT	Owned		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
34	Kirkpatrick Street	Weston, ACT	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
35	Hains Building, Princess Ave & Sharp Street	Cooma, NSW	Leased	79.9%	Vacant, allowance for churn
36	2 Barrow Street	Queanbeyan, NSW	Leased	50.0%	Site is predominantly archives with office area attached
37	Garden Street	Eveleigh, NSW	Leased	69.2%	Vacant, allowance for churn
38	Part Level 2, 55-57 Berry Street	Nowra, NSW	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
39	Level 1, 2 & 3, 311 High St	Penrith, NSW	Leased	66.9%	Vacant, allowance for churn
40	34 Lowe Street	Queanbeyan, NSW	Leased	63.6%	Vacant, allowance for churn
41	28-32 King Street	Raymond Terrace, NSW	Leased	85.1%	Vacant, allowance for churn
42	Defence Plaza, 270 Pitt Street	Sydney, NSW	Leased	74.6%	Vacant, allowance for churn
43	Suite 104 76 Morgan St	Wagga Wagga, NSW	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
44	Hydrographic Office, 8 Station St	Wollongong, NSW	Leased	93.5%	Vacant, allowance for churn
45	8 McMinn Street	Darwin, NT	Leased	97.2%	Vacant, allowance for churn
46	36 Mitchell Street	Darwin, NT	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
47	Lot 6633, 3 Tybell Street	Winnellie, NT	Leased	68.2%	Vacant, allowance for churn
48	151-171 Roma Street	Brisbane, QLD	Leased	85.6%	Vacant, allowance for churn
49	4/97 Spence St	Cairns, QLD	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
50	3 Jensen St	Cairns, QLD	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
51	71 Osborne Road	Mitchelton, QLD	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
52	Nathan Business Centre, 340 Ross River Road Aitkenvale	Townsville, QLD	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
53	DSTO Facility Moggil Road CSIRO	Pullenvale, QLD	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
54	6-14 Oxenham Street	Dudley Park, SA	Leased	84.2%	Vacant, allowance for churn

No	Name of Property	Location of the building (city, state)	Leased/Owned	Occupancy Rate (%)	If occupancy is identified as less than 100%, for what is the remaining used
55	Defence Plaza, 661 Bourke St	Melbourne, VIC	Leased	83.2%	Vacant, allowance for churn
56	Units 1-5, 105 Winton Road	Joondalup, WA	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
57	85 Chalgrove Avenue	Rockingham, WA	Leased	95.3%	Vacant, allowance for churn
58	Unit 3, 23-25 Chalgrove Avenue	Rockingham, WA	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
Residential					
1	Paramatta Rd & Powell St	Homebush, NSW	Leased	100%	
2	Paramatta Rd & Powell St	Homebush, NSW	Leased	100%	
3	27-29 George St	North Strathfield, NSW	Leased	100%	
4	6 Abbots Nest	Christmas Island, WA	Leased	100%	
Buildings (Non Commercial Office)					
1	Canberra Airport SPA Facilities	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased		Not Applicable
2	6-18 Mort St	Canberra, ACT	Leased		Not Applicable
3	50 Sheppard St	Hume, ACT	Leased		Not Applicable
5	44-46 Dacre St	Mitchell, ACT	Leased		Not Applicable
6	38 Townsville St	Fyshwick, ACT	Leased		Not Applicable
9	172/5 Bass St	Queanbeyan, NSW	Leased		Not Applicable
10	171/5 Bass St	Queanbeyan, NSW	Leased		Not Applicable
11	400 Harris St	Ultimo, NSW	Leased		Not Applicable
12	677 Day Ave	Kensington, NSW	Leased		Not Applicable
13	Unit 2, 923-935 Bourke Road	Alexandria, NSW	Leased		Not Applicable
14	Cnr Darlington & City Road	Darlington, NSW	Leased		Not Applicable
15	Munster St	Port Macquarie, NSW	Leased		Not Applicable
16	Munster St	Port Macquarie, NSW	Leased		Not Applicable
17	119 Fitzroy St	Cowra, NSW	Leased		Not Applicable
18	Cloncurry Aerodrome	Cloncurry, QLD	Leased		Not Applicable
19	Archer & Hubert St	South Townsville, QLD	Leased		Not Applicable
20	Rockhampton Airport	Rockhampton, QLD	Leased		Not Applicable
21	82 Cowle Rd	Bridgewater, TAS	Leased		Not Applicable
22	15 Fowler Rd	Dandenong, VIC	Leased		Not Applicable
23	Defence Prototype Eng Services Units 1 & 2 26 William Angliss Dr	Laverton North, VIC	Leased		Not Applicable
24	Unit 4, Lot 184	Cocos Island, WA	Leased		Not Applicable
25	10 Savery Way	Rockingham, WA	Leased		Not Applicable
26	Dixon Road MUD	Rockingham, WA	Leased		Not Applicable
27	20 Nautical Dr	Henderson, WA	Leased		Not Applicable
28	'Cyril Vickery Pavilion', Cnr Station St & Albany Hwy	Cannington, WA	Leased		Not Applicable

Senate Standing Committee on Defence, Foreign Affairs and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Contracts for Temporary Staff

Question reference number: 106

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) How much did the department/agency spend on temporary or contract staff?
- (b) How many temporary or contract staff have been employed?
- (c) What is the total number of temporary or contract staff currently employed?
- (d) How much was paid for agencies/companies to find temporary/contract staff?
- (e) Have there been any changes to the policies/criteria that govern the appointment of contract staff?

Answer:

- (a) Temporary staff, and staff on temporary contracts, are referred to as non-ongoing employees in Defence. Defence spent \$3.6 million from 14 September 2015 to 24 February 2016.
- (b) From 14 September 2015 to 24 February 2016, 55 non-ongoing employees commenced work with Defence.
- (c) As at 24 February 2016, Defence employed 108 non-ongoing employees. Note that this is a headcount figure, and counts all personnel equally regardless of the number of hours worked.
- (d) Since 14 September 2015, Defence made credit card payments of \$6,677.94 (GST inclusive) to agencies/companies in the Merchant Category “Employment Agencies, Temporary Staff Services” to find non-going employees.
- (e) Since 14 September 2015, there was an Australian Public Service Commission (APSC) and Australian Public Service (APS) wide policy change which relates to the ability to engage an employee, who has recently separated on a Voluntary Redundancy (VR), as a non-ongoing employee if there is sufficient justification as to the critical need for the employee’s skills before his/her period of exclusion expires.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Departmental Printing

Question reference number: 107

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) Please list all documents that have been printed at the expense of the department/agency where 500 or more copies have been produced? Please include the total number produced as well.
 - (i) How many of these printed documents were also published online?
- (b) Has the Department/Agency used external printing services for any print jobs?
 - (i) If so, what companies were used?
 - (ii) How were they selected?
 - (iii) What was the total cost of this printing by item?

Answer:

(a) and (b) These questions have been previously answered under Question on Notice No. 93 from Additional Budget Estimates of 26 February 2014. This response remains extant.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Communications staff

Question reference number: 108

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

For all departments and agencies, please provide – in relation to all public relations, communications and media staff – the following:

- (a) How many ongoing staff, their classification, the type of work they undertake and their location.
- (b) How many non-ongoing staff, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location
- (c) How many contractors, their classification, type of work they undertake and their location
- (d) How many are graphic designers?
- (e) How many are media managers?
- (f) How many organise events?
- (g) Have these arrangements changed since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015? If yes, please detail.

Answer:

- (a) There are 138 ongoing communication and media staff, comprising 81 Australian Public Service (APS), 54 Australian Defence Force (ADF) and three contracted staff performing communication roles across Groups and Services in Defence.

They are classified as follows:

Executive Level 2: 9

Executive Level 1: 26

APS6: 21

APS5: 6

APS 4/5: 2

APS 4: 3

Public Affairs Officer 3: 10

Public Affairs Officer 2: 4

Commander: 1

Lieutenant Commander: 3

Lieutenant (RAN): 5

Sub Lieutenant: 1

Leading Seaman: 1
Colonel: 2
Lieutenant Colonel: 3
Major: 9
Captain: 6
Warrant Officer 2: 2
Sergeant: 2
Corporal: 4
Wing Commander: 1
Squadron Leader: 4
Flight Lieutenant: 8
Flight Officer: 1
Corporal (RAAF): 1
Contractors: 3

Public affairs, communications and media staff within Defence undertake communication and public affairs activities across a broad range of Defence functions. These include corporate campaigns, media operations, internal and external communication, entertainment media, branding, digital media management, community relations, event management and the production of communication material such as talking points, statements, media releases and alerts, and speeches.

Staff numbers and locations are as follow:

NSW: 22
ACT: 93
Vic: 7
SA: 5
WA: 1
NT: 2
Qld: 8

- (b) There are no non-ongoing staff.
- (b) There are three contractors: one web designer (Vic), one graphic designer (ACT) and one writer (SA).
- (d) There are six graphic designers, one of whom is a contractor.
- (e) and (f) Due to the broad nature of responsibilities, no one has the single duty of media management or event management.
- (g) Communication staff details were collected on 25 September 2015 shortly after the change of Prime Ministers. There were 135 ongoing staff members comprising 89 APS, 44 ADF and two contracted staff performing communication roles across Groups and Services in Defence.

They were classified at the time as follows:

Executive Level 2: 8
Executive Level 1: 30
APS6: 25
APS5: 6
APS 4/5: 3
APS 4: 1
Public Affairs Officer 3: 14
Public Affairs Officer 2: 2
Commander: 1
Lieutenant Commander: 2
Lieutenant (RAN): 5
Sub Lieutenant: 1
Leading Seaman: 1
Colonel: 2
Lieutenant Colonel: 2
Major: 3
Captain: 11
Warrant Officer 2: 2
Sergeant: 1
Corporal: 3
Squadron Leader: 2
Flight Lieutenant: 5
Flight Officer: 2
Corporal (RAAF): 1
Contractors: 2

On 25 September 2015, staff numbers and locations were as follows:

NSW - 16
ACT - 96
VIC - 9
SA - 5
WA - 1
NT - 1
QLD - 7

There were five graphic designers.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Departmental Reviews

Question reference number: 109

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September 2015:

(a) How many new reviews (defined as review, inter-departmental group, inquiry, internal review or similar activity) have been commenced? Please list them including:

- i. the date they were ordered
- ii. the date they commenced
- iii. the minister responsible
- iv. the department responsible
- v. the nature of the review
- vi. their terms of reference
- vii. the scope of the review
- viii. Who is conducting the review
- ix. the number of officers, and their classification level, involved in conducting the review
- x. the expected report date
- xi. the budgeted, projected or expected costs
- xii. If the report will be tabled in parliament or made public

(b) For any review commenced or ordered, have any external people, companies or contractors being engaged to assist or conduct the review?

- i. If so, please list them, including their name and/or trading name/s and any known alias or other trading names
- ii. If so, please list their managing director and the board of directors or equivalent
- iii. If yes, for each is the cost associated with their involvement, including a break down for each cost item
- iv. If yes, for each, what is the nature of their involvement
- v. If yes, for each, are they on the lobbyist register, provide details.
- vi. If yes, for each, what contact has the Minister or their office had with them
- vii. If yes, for each, who selected them

- viii. If yes, for each, did the minister or their office have any involvement in selecting them,
1. If yes, please detail what involvement it was
 2. If yes, did they see or provided input to a short list
 3. If yes, on what dates did this involvement occur
 4. If yes, did this involve any verbal discussions with the department
 5. If yes, on what dates did this involvement occur

(c) Which reviews are on-going?

- i. Please list them.
- ii. What is the current cost to date expended on the reviews?

(d) Have any reviews been stopped, paused or ceased? Please list them.

(e) Which reviews have concluded? Please list them.

(f) How many reviews have been provided to Government? Please list them and the date they were provided.

(g) When will the Government be responding to the respective reviews that have been completed?

(h) What reviews are planned?

- i. When will each planned review be commenced?
- ii. When will each of these reviews be concluded?
- iii. When will government respond to each review?
- iv. Will the government release each review?
 1. If so, when? If not, why not

Answer:

(a) to (c) Table A provides input of the reviews that have commenced since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September 2015.

(d) to (h). Nil.

Table A: Reviews Commenced since 14 September 2014

Air Force Training Efficiency – Internal Review	
(a)(i). the date ordered	12 October 2015
(a)(ii). the date commenced	January 2016
(a)(iii). the minister responsible	Not applicable - Internal Review
(a)(iv). the department responsible	Defence
(a)(v). the nature of the review	Air Force Training Efficiency
(a)(vi). their terms of reference	A review is being conducted into the effectiveness of the current Professional Military Education & Training curricula. It will make recommendations regarding how and what Learning Outcomes may be delivered to support efficiency in the system.
(a)(vii). the scope of the review	<p>The review will examine or ensure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Air Commander Australia's proposal to reduce Initial Officer Course (IOC) from 17 weeks to 8-10 weeks; 2. Aviation Academy work that identifies the need for eight entry points to IOC per year; 3. That only essential content is retained to alleviate course length pressures; 4. Exploration of a common induction phase for Officer and Airmen (ab initio) courses 5. Air Force Reserve ab initio training and Initial Employment Training (IET) and delivery requirements.
(a)(viii). Who is conducting the review	Directorate of Strategic Education and Training – Air Force
(a)(ix). the number of officers, and their classification level, involved in conducting the review	Group Captain (Reservist)

(a)(x). the expected report delivery date	20 June 2016
(a)(xi). the budgeted, projected or expected costs	Approx \$30,000.00 (comprising an estimated 50 reserve days plus associated travel).
(a)(xii). If the report will be tabled in parliament or made public	No. Internal review only.
(b)(i)-(viii)	Nil

After Action Review Estate Services Division Operating Model	
(a)(i). the date ordered	3 February 2016
(a)(ii). the date commenced	4 February 2016
(a)(iii). the minister responsible	Not applicable - Internal Review
(a)(iv). the department responsible	Defence / Estate and Infrastructure Group / Estate Services Division
(a)(v). the nature of the review	After Action Review Estate Services Division Operating Model
(a)(vi). their terms of reference	Conduct an independent assessment of the current state of the Estate Services Division Operating Model and Base Support Contracts and provide recommendations for improvement in preparation for the development of the Enterprise Defence Service Delivery Model.
(a)(vii). the scope of the review	<p>Undertake an After Action Review of the retendering of the Base Services Contracts and the implementation of the Estate Services Division Operating Model. Specifically to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Assess the outcomes of the implementation of the Estate Services Division Operating Model. b. Assess the outcomes of the implementation of the Base Services Contracts. c. Analyse the degree to which the Estate Services Division Operating Model and the Base Service Contracts are harmonised. d. Position Estate Services Division for transitioning to the Enterprise Defence Service Delivery Model. <p>The scope of the After Action Review will include the degree to which the current operation of Estate Services Division is (a) effective and (b) meets customer needs.</p>
(a)(viii). Who is conducting the review	KPMG Australia
(a)(ix). the number of officers, and their classification level, involved in conducting the review	Not applicable
(a)(x). the expected report delivery date	31 March 2016
(a)(xi). the budgeted, projected or expected costs	\$172,711.50

(a)(xii). If the report will be tabled in parliament or made public	No – internal review.
(b) For any review commenced or ordered, have any external people, companies or contractors being engaged to assist or conduct the review	
(b)(i). If so, please list them, including their name and/or trading name/s and any known alias or other trading names	KPMG Australia
(b)(ii) If so, please list their managing director and the board of directors or equivalent	<p>Peter Nash Australian Chairman Gary Wingrove Chief Executive Officer Andrew Dickinson Partner Audit and Assurance David Gelb Partner Tax Ian Jedlin Partner Advisory Stuart Rose Partner Private Enterprise Denise McComish Partner Audit and Assurance Liz Forsyth Partner Advisory Angus Reynolds Partners Advisory</p>
(b)(iii) If yes, for each is the cost associated with their involvement, including a break down for each cost item	Total GST inclusive cost is \$172,711.50 (payable upon delivery of the final deliverable and completion of the services).
(b)(iv) If yes, for each, what is the nature of their involvement	<p>KPMG Australia personnel 1 x Principal Practitioner Full Time Contractor Lead 1 x Practitioner Full Time Administration Officer 1 x Pre-Eminent Specialist and 2 x Executive Practitioners for specialist subject matter expertise</p>
(b)(v) If yes, for each, are they on the lobbyist register, provide details.	No

(b)(vi). If yes, for each, what contact has the Minister or their office had with them	None as part of this procurement.
(b)(vii) If yes, for each, who selected them	Department of Defence, First Assistant Secretary Estate Services
(b)(viii). If yes, for each, did the minister or their office have any involvement in selecting them 1. If yes, please detail what involvement it was 2. If yes, did they see or provided input to a short list 3. If yes, on what dates did this involvement occur 4. If yes, did this involve any verbal discussions with the department 5. If yes, on what dates did this involvement occur	Not applicable.

Senate Standing Committee of Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Commissioned Reports

Question reference number: 110

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) How many reports (including paid external advice) have been commissioned by the Minister, department or agency?
 - (i) Please provide details of each report including date commissioned,
 - (ii) Date report handed to Government,
 - (iii) Date of public release,
 - (iv) Terms of Reference and
 - (v) Committee members.
- (b)
 - (i) How much did each report cost/or is estimated to cost?
 - (ii) How many departmental or external staff were involved in each report and at what level?
- (c) What is the current status of each report? When is the Government intending to respond to these reports?

Answer:

(a) to (c) For the period 14 September 2015 to 8 March 2016

COMMISSIONED REPORT – <i>Moral Injury: From Conceptual Clarity to Practical Procedures</i>	
Details of report and the date commissioned	In March 2015, Professor Tom Frame, Director Study of Armed Conflict and Society (ACSACS), was invited to submit to the Vice Chief of the Defence Force (VCDF) a proposal to conduct research into moral injury. The subsequent proposal was titled <i>Moral Injury: From Conceptual Clarity to Practical Procedures</i> and it was determined that the Australian Defence College Centre for Defence Leadership and Ethics (CDLE) would manage the project. The report was commissioned on 1 January 2016.

Date report handed to government	The report is due for completion by 30 June 2017 and a copy will be provided to the Minister for Defence.
Date of public release	Not applicable.
Terms of Reference	Not applicable.
Committee Members	Not applicable.
Estimated Cost of report	\$300,000
Departmental and external staff involved in the report	The report is still in the development phase and as such Defence is unable to provide the number of departmental and external staff involved in the report.
Current Status of Each Report	This report is still in the development phase.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Board Appointments

Question reference number: 111

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question: Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) Please detail any board appointments made to date.
- (b) What is the gender ratio on each board and across the portfolio?
- (c) Has the department instigated or changed its gender ratio target and/or any other policy intended to increase the participation rate of women on boards? If yes, please specify what the target and policy is for each board.
- (d) Please specify when these gender ratio or participation policies were changed.

Answer:

- (a) & (b) Details of all board appointments, including date of appointment and gender, are available at <http://www.ausgovboards.gov.au/>
- (c) No.
- (d) Not applicable.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Stationery Requirements

Question reference number: 112

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) How much has been spent by each department and agency on the government (Ministers / Parliamentary Secretaries) stationery requirements in your portfolio to date?
 - (i) Detail the items provided to the minister's office.
 - (ii) Please specify how many reams of paper have been supplied to the Minister's office.
- (b) How much has been spent on departmental stationery requirements to date.
- (c) Has any customised stationery been requested or provided to the Minister or Ministerial Staff? If yes, please include a photo/scan, detail the type of stationery, date it was requested, date it was provided and the cost.

Answer:

- (a)(i) The Stationery cost borne by the Department of Defence on behalf of the Ministers from 14 September 2015 to 29 February 2016 was \$6,079.26 (GST exclusive). A breakdown of these costs is below.

Office of the	Sundry Stationery Cost
Minister for Defence (Senator the Hon Marise Payne)	\$2855.30
Former Minister for Defence (The Hon Kevin Andrews MP)	\$1694.53
Minister for Defence Materiel (The Hon Dan Tehan MP)	\$0.00
Former Minister for Defence Materiel and Science (The Hon Mal Brough MP)	\$967.91
Former Assistant Minister for Defence (The Hon Stuart Robert MP)	\$121.03
Assistant Minister for Defence (The Hon Michael McCormack MP)	\$0.00
Former Assistant Minister for Defence (The Hon Darren Chester MP)	\$440.49
TOTAL (GST exclusive)	\$6,079.26

Sundry stationery includes general use copy paper, desk accessories, filing and storage supplies, flags and labels, markers and highlighters, notebooks and pads, office essentials, pens and pencils, rubber stamps, and sticky notes.

Stationery is provided to the Ministers' Offices by the department on a regular basis; consequently, providing the details of all items supplied to each office would be an unreasonable diversion of departmental resources.

- (a)(ii) A breakdown of the reams of paper supplied to the Ministers' Offices from 14 September 2015 to 29 February 2016 is below.

Office	Reams
Minister for Defence (Senator the Hon Marise Payne) Former Minister for Defence (The Hon Kevin Andrews MP)	269
Minister for Defence Materiel (The Hon Dan Tehan MP) Former Minister for Defence Materiel and Science (The Hon Mal Brough MP) Former Assistant Minister for Defence (The Hon Stuart Robert MP)	25
Assistant Minister for Defence (The Hon Michael McCormack MP) Former Assistant Minister for Defence (The Hon Darren Chester MP)	50

- (b) The total departmental cost for stationery from 14 September 2015 to 31 January 2016 was \$3,553,762.82 (GST exclusive).
- (c) No customised stationery has been supplied to the Ministers' Offices from 14 September 2015 to 29 February 2016.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Ministerial IT

Question reference number: 113

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (1) Other than phones, iPads or computers – please list the electronic equipment provided to the Minister's office.
 - (a) List the items
 - (b) List the items location or normal location
 - (c) List if the item is in the possession of the office or an individual staff member of minister, if with an individual list their employment classification level
 - (d) List the total cost of the items
 - (e) List an itemised cost breakdown of these items
 - (f) List the date they were provided to the office
 - (g) Note if the items were requested by the office or proactively provided by the department

Answer:

(1) (a) to (g) Table A lists the electronic equipment provided to the Minister's office from 14 September 2015 to 10 February 2016.

TABLE A: List of non-ICT electronic items provided to the Office of the Minister for Defence from 14 September 2015

(a) List of items	(b) Location of items	(c) in possession of Office or individual?	(e) Cost of items (incl GST)	(f) Date provided	(g) Requested by Minister's Office or Department?
4 outlet power board	Defence Minister's Office, Parliament House	Defence Minister's Office	\$16.00	30 September 2015	Defence Minister's Office
Panasonic 40" LCD TV	Defence Minister's Office, Parliament House	Defence Minister's Office	\$1,390	30 September 2015	Defence Minister's Office
Samsung 40" LED TV	Defence Minister's Office, Parliament House	Defence Minister's Office	\$795.00	14 October 2015	Defence Minister's Office
Universal Remote Control	Defence Minister's Office, Parliament House	Defence Minister's Office	\$39.95	8 December 2015	Defence Minister's Office
(d) Total cost of items provided:			\$2,240.95		

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Media Subscriptions

Question reference number: 114

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September 2015:

(1) What pay TV subscriptions does your department/agency have?

- (a) Please provide a list of channels and the reason for each channel.
- (b) What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period?
- (c) What is provided to the Minister or their office?
- (d) What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period?

(2) What newspaper subscriptions does your department/agency have?

- (a) Please provide a list of newspaper subscriptions and the reason for each.
- (b) What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period?
- (c) What is provided to the Minister or their office?
- (d) What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period?

(3) What magazine subscriptions does your department/agency have?

- (a) Please provide a list of magazine subscriptions and the reason for each.
- (b) What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period?
- (c) What is provided to the Minister or their office?
- (d) What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period?

(4) What publications does your department/agency purchase?

- (a) Please provide a list of publications purchased by the department and the reason for each.
- (b) What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period?
- (c) What is provided to the Minister or their office?
- (d) What has been the cost of this package/s during the specified period?

Answer:

- (1) (a) Please refer to Question on Notice No 92 from Supplementary Budget Estimates 22 October 2014.
- (b) Defence's total expenditure on TV subscriptions from 14 September 2015 to 29 February 2016 was \$260,744.91 (GST exclusive).
- (c) No TV subscriptions have been provided to Defence Ministerial Offices between 14 September 2015 and 29 February 2016.
- (d) Nil.
- (2) (a) Please refer to Question on Notice No 92 from Supplementary Budget Estimates 22 October 2014.
- (b) Defence's total expenditure on newspaper subscriptions from 14 September 2015 to 29 February 2016 was \$84,061.19 (GST exclusive).
- (c) The table below outlines a list of newspaper subscriptions provided to Defence Ministerial Offices:

Defence Ministerial Office	Newspapers
Minister for Defence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courier Mail • Daily Telegraph • Financial Review • Herald Sun • Sydney Morning Herald • The Adelaide Advertiser • The Age • The Australian • The Canberra Times • The Economist*
Assistant Minister for Defence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial Review • Herald Sun • Sydney Morning Herald

Defence Ministerial Office	Newspapers
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Age • The Australian
Parliamentary Secretary for Defence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial Review • Herald Sun • The Age • The Australian
Minister for Defence Materiel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courier Mail • Financial Review • Herald Sun • The Age • The Australian • The Canberra Times

* subscription ceased on 21 September 2015

(d) Newspaper subscriptions expenditure for Defence Ministerial Offices from 14 September 2015 to 29 February 2016 is outlined in the table below:

Defence Ministerial Office	Expenditure (GST Exclusive)
Minister for Defence	\$3,721.68
Assistant Minister for Defence	\$831.29
Parliamentary Secretary for Defence	\$944.18
Minister for Defence Materiel	\$189.00
Total	\$5,686.15

- (3) (a) Please refer to Question on Notice No 92 from Supplementary Budget Estimates 22 October 2014.
- (b) Defence's total expenditure on magazine subscriptions from 14 September 2015 to 29 February 2016 was \$48,664.31 (GST exclusive).
- (c) No magazine subscriptions have been provided to Defence Ministerial Offices between 14 September 2015 and 29 February 2016.
- (d) Nil.

- (4) (a) The table below outlines a list of publications purchased by Defence and the reasons for the purchases:

Publications	Reasons
A range of books, manuals, and reference material such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air Safety Compliance • Building Manual • Emergency Management Australia Manual • Financial Investigation & Forensic Accounting • Life Cycle Costing Guide • Project Management Text Books • Standards of Construction • Various SAP Manuals 	Publications are purchased to maintain strategic awareness and provide subject matter reference material/technical information.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intelligence Material 	Subscriptions to independently-produced intelligence assessment materials to increase Defence's threat assessment capability (informing Defence of cyber threats and topics of interest).

- (b) Defence's total expenditure on publications from 14 September 2015 to 29 February 2016 was \$2,123,389.39 (GST exclusive).

- (c) The table below lists publications purchased for Defence Ministerial Offices.

Defence Ministerial Office	Publications
Minister for Defence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Journal of Electronic Defence (Monthly magazine of electronic warfare)

- (d) Nil

Senate Standing Committee Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Departmental Meetings

Question reference number: 115

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) How much has the Department/Agency spent on meeting costs? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events, including any catering and drinks costs.
- (b) For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, please detail total meeting spend from to date. Detail date, location, purpose and cost of each event including any catering and drinks costs.
- (c) What meeting spend is the Department/Agency's planning on spending? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of all events including any catering and drinks costs.
- (d) For each Minister and Parliamentary Secretary office, what meeting spend is currently being planned for? Detail date, location, purpose and cost of each event including any catering and drinks costs.

Answer:

(a) to (d) These questions have been previously answered under Question on Notice No. 86 from Additional Estimates 26 February 2014. This response remains extant.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates - 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Media training

Question reference number: 116

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (1) In relation to media training services purchased by each department/agency, please provide the following information:
 - (a) Total spending on these services
 - (b) An itemised cost breakdown of these services
 - (c) The number of employees offered these services and their employment classification
 - (d) The number of employees who have utilised these services and their employment classification
 - (e) The names of all service providers engaged
 - (f) The location that this training was provided.
- (2) For each service purchased from a provider listed under (1), please provide:
 - (a) The name and nature of the service purchased
 - (b) Whether the service is one-on-one or group based
 - (c) The number of employees who received the service and their employment classification (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)
 - (d) The total number of hours involved for all employees (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)
 - (e) The total amount spent on the service
 - (f) A description of the fees charged (i.e. per hour, complete package).
- (3) Where a service was provided at any location other than the department or agency's own premises, please provide:
- (4) The location used
- (5) The number of employees who took part on each occasion

(6) The total number of hours involved for all employees who took part (provide a breakdown for each employment classification)

(7) Any costs the department or agency's incurred to use the location

Answer:

(1) (a) The total cost of media training provided to staff from 14 September 2015 to 4 March 2016 was \$175,369.75.

(1) (b), (d)-(f), (2) (a)-(f) The information requested is provided in the tables below:

Date	Location	Supplier	# trained	Group/ 1-on-1	Hours/ person	Cost \$
23-24 Sep 2015	Canberra	Media Manoeuvres	18	Group	7.5	22,174.59
25 Sep 2015	Adelaide	Science Media Exchange	2	1-on-1	2	650.00
30 Sept 2015	Melbourne	Science in Public	11	Group	7.5	7,000.00
1 Oct 2015	Canberra	Media Manoeuvres	1	1-on-1	4	6,202.74
1 Oct 2015	Melbourne	Science in Public	8	Group	7.5	7,000.00
12 Oct 2015	Melbourne	Science in Public	8	Group	7.5	7,000.00
16 Oct 2015	Canberra	Media Manoeuvres	7	Group	7.5	12,960.47
19 Oct 2015	Canberra	Media Manoeuvres	8	Group	7.5	11,782.25
29 Oct 2015	RAAF Edinburgh	Science Media Exchange	9	Group	7.5	5,010.00
3 Nov 2015	Canberra	Media Manoeuvres	2	1-on-1	7.5	11,413.17
6 Nov 2015	RAAF Williamstown	Media Manoeuvres	2	1-on-1	7.5	7,021.41
18 Nov 2015	Canberra	Media Manoeuvres	6	Group	7.5	13,099.18
19 Nov 2015	Canberra	Media Manoeuvres	8	Group	7.5	11,990.00
2 Dec 2015	Melbourne	Science in Public	9	Group	7.5	7,100.00
29 Jan 2016	Adelaide	Science Media Exchange	1	1-on-1	2	700.00
2 Feb 2016	Canberra	Media Manoeuvres	1	1-on-1	3.5	7,731.71
9 Feb 2016	Canberra	Media Manoeuvres	12	Group	7.5	16,104.23

15 Feb 2016	RAAF Base Pearce	Media Manoeuvres	1	1-on-1	7.5	10,560.00
24 Feb 2016	HMAS Watson	Cathy Reid Communications	17	Group	7	9,870.00
TOTAL			131			\$175,369.75

Note: All training was delivered as a package.

Breakdown of employment classification

Rank/Level	Number
SES	4
Executive Level 2	8
Executive Level 1	34
APS 6	2
Science and Technology (S&T) level 3-4	13
S&T level 5	7
S&T level 6	15
S&T level 7	6
S&T level 8	2
PAO3	1
PAO2	1
RADM	1
CMDR	6
LCDR	7
CAPT (RAN)	1
LEUT (RAN)	5
Brigadier (E)	2
Colonel (E)	2
Lieutenant Colonel (E)	1
Major (E)	2
Sapper	1
AVM	2
AIRCDRE	3
GPCAPT	1
WGCDR	3
SQNLDR	1
Total:	131

- (1) (c) Media awareness and skills training is offered to all Defence employees whose duties require them to interact with the media. It is not possible to identify all of the employees who would be categorised as requiring this training.
- (3) The requested detail is provided below.
- (4) The two Defence Science and Technology Group Adelaide training sessions were held at The Australian Science Media Centre, 55 Exchange Place, Adelaide SA 5000.
- (5) Three staff members in total.

- (6) A breakdown of hours for the two off-site sessions is included in the table above. The classification of the three people who attended the offsite training is two Science and Technology (S&T) level 3-4 and one S&T level 7-8.
- (7) There were no additional costs incurred for the use of the location for the two off-site sessions.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Consultancies

Question reference number: 117

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) How many consultancies have been undertaken? Identify the name of the consultant, the subject matter of the consultancy, the duration and cost of the arrangement, and the method of procurement (ie. open tender, direct source, etc). Also include total value for all consultancies.
- (b) How many consultancies are planned for this calendar year? Have these been published in your Annual Procurement Plan (APP) on the AusTender website and if not why not? In each case please identify the subject matter, duration, cost and method of procurement as above, and the name of the consultant if known.
- (c) Have any consultancies not gone out for tender?
 - (i) List each, including name, cost and purpose
 - (ii) If so, why?

Answer:

- (a) and (c) Defence contracts above \$10,000 are published on the AusTender website (www.tenders.gov.au), including details of consultant, subject matter of the consultancy, duration, cost of the arrangement and method of procurement.
- (b) Defence consulting contracts are typically entered into in response to current operational and business requirements which are completed within short time frames. Therefore the details of consultancies planned for the calendar year will be published on AusTender, where appropriate, when the contract is let.

Consulting procurement activities above \$1 million are included in Defence's Procurement Plan and published on the AusTender website.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Provision of ICT Equipment – Minister's Office

Question reference number: 118

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) For departments/agencies that provide mobile phones to Ministers and/or Parliamentary Secretaries and/or their offices, what type of mobile phone has been provided and the costs?
 - (i) Itemise equipment and cost broken down by staff or minister classification
- (b) Has electronic equipment (such as ipad, laptop, wireless card, vasco token, blackberry, mobile phone (list type if relevant), thumb drive, video cameras) been provided by the department/agency?

If yes provide a list of:

- (c) What is provided?
- (d) The purchase cost.
- (e) The ongoing cost.
- (f) A list of any accessories provided for the equipment and the cost of those accessories. (e.g. iPad keyboards, laptop carry bags, additional chargers etc).
- (g) A breakdown of what staff and staff classification receives each item.

Answer:

(a) (i) Mobile phones provided and associated costs for the period 14 September 2015 to 29 February 2016 are as follows:

Mobile Phone Provided to	Type of Mobile Phone	Cost of Mobile Phone (ex GST)
Minister for Defence	iPhone 6 Plus 64GB	\$1,178.18
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 Plus 64GB	\$1,178.18
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 Plus 64GB	\$1,178.18
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 Plus 64GB	\$1,178.18
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 Plus 64GB	\$1,178.18
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45

Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45
Former Minister for Defence Materiel	iPhone 6 Plus 64GB	\$1,178.18
Minister for Defence Materiel	iPhone 6 Plus 64GB	\$1,178.18
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 Plus 64GB	\$1,178.18
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45
Former Assistant Minister for Defence	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45
Assistant Minister for Defence	iPhone 6S 128GB	\$1,243.64
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 Plus 64GB	\$1,178.18
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45

(b) to (g) Table A below details ICT equipment provided to the Ministers and their staff.

TABLE A: ICT Equipment Provided to the Ministers and Staff 14 September 2015 to 29 February 2016

(7) Items Provided to:	(3) Items Provided	(4) Purchase Cost (ex GST)	(5) Ongoing Cost	(6) List of Accessories and Costs Associated (ex GST)
Minister for Defence	iPhone 6 Plus 64GB	\$1,178.18	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra Leather Folio for iPhone 6 Plus (\$20.91) Telstra Screen Protector for iPhone 6 Plus (\$5.45)
	iPad Mini 4 64GB	\$763.64	Nil	Standard iPad accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra iPad Air 2 Screen Protector (\$7.27)
Chief of Staff	HP Elite 820 Laptop	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	HP Laptop Bag (Nil Cost)
	Telstra 4G Data Card	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Standard Telstra accessories in box (Nil Cost)
	iPad Air 2 64GB	\$807.27	Nil	Logitech Folio Case (\$119.00)
	iPhone 6 Plus 64GB	\$1,178.18	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra Leather Folio for iPhone 6 Plus (\$20.91)

				Telstra Screen Protector for iPhone 6 Plus (\$5.45)
	DREAMS Token	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Nil
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra Leather Folio for iPhone 6 (\$20.00) Telstra Screen Protector for iPhone 6 (\$4.55)
	DREAMS Token	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Nil
	HP Elite 820 Laptop	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	HP Laptop Bag (Nil Cost)
	Telstra 4G Data Card	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Standard Telstra accessories in box (Nil Cost)
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra Leather Folio for iPhone 6 (\$20.00) Telstra Screen Protector for iPhone 6 (\$4.55)
	iPad Mini 4 64GB	\$763.64	Nil	Standard iPad accessories in box (Nil Cost)

				Telstra iPad Air 2 Screen Protector (\$7.27)
	DREAMS Token	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Nil
	HP Elite 820 Laptop	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	HP Laptop Bag (Nil Cost)
	Telstra 4G Data Card	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Standard Telstra accessories in box (Nil Cost)
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 Plus 64GB	\$1,178.18	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra Leather Folio for iPhone 6 Plus (\$20.91) Telstra Screen Protector for iPhone 6 Plus (\$5.45)
	iPad Mini 4 64GB	\$763.64	Nil	Standard iPad accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra iPad Air 2 Screen Protector (\$7.27)
	DREAMS Token	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Nil
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 Plus 64GB	\$1,178.18	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra Leather Folio for iPhone 6 Plus

				(\$20.91) Telstra Screen Protector for iPhone 6 Plus (\$5.45)
	iPad Mini 4 64GB	\$763.64	Nil	Standard iPad accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra iPad Air 2 Screen Protector (\$7.27) Belkin iPad Air 2 Slim Style Keyboard Case (\$78.18)
	DREAMS Token	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Nil
	HP Elite 820 Laptop	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	HP Laptop Bag (Nil Cost)
	Telstra 4G Data Card	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Standard Telstra accessories in box (Nil Cost)
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 Plus 64GB	\$1,178.18	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra Leather Folio for iPhone 6 Plus (\$20.91) Telstra Screen Protector for iPhone 6 Plus (\$5.45)

	DREAMS Token	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Nil
	HP Elite 820 Laptop	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	HP Laptop Bag (Nil Cost)
	Telstra 4G Data Card	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Standard Telstra accessories in box (Nil Cost)
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64 GB	\$1,025.45	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra Leather Folio for iPhone 6 (\$20.00) Telstra Screen Protector for iPhone 6 (\$4.55)
	iPad Mini 4 64GB	\$763.64	Nil	Standard iPad accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra iPad Air 2 Screen Protector (\$7.27) Belkin iPad Air 2 Slim Style Keyboard Case (\$78.18)
	DREAMS Token	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Nil
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra Leather Folio for iPhone 6 (\$20.00)

				Telstra Screen Protector for iPhone 6 (\$4.55)
	DREAMS Token	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Nil
	HP Elite 820 Laptop	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	HP Laptop Bag (Nil Cost)
	Telstra 4G Data Card	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Standard Telstra accessories in box (Nil Cost)
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra Leather Folio for iPhone 6 (\$20.00) Telstra Screen Protector for iPhone 6 (\$4.55)
Former Minister for Defence Materiel	iPhone 6 Plus 64GB	\$1,178.18	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra Leather Folio for iPhone 6 Plus (\$20.91) Telstra Screen Protector for iPhone 6 Plus (\$5.45)
Minister for Defence Materiel	iPhone 6 Plus 64GB	\$1,178.18	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost)

	DREAMS Token	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Nil
Chief of Staff	iPhone 6 Plus 64GB	\$1,178.18	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost)
	iPad Mini 4 64GB	\$763.64	Nil	Standard iPad accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra iPad Air 2 Screen Protector (\$7.27)
	DREAMS Token	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Nil
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra Leather Folio for iPhone 6 (\$20.00) Telstra Screen Protector for iPhone 6 (\$4.55)
	DREAMS Token	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Nil
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra Leather Folio for iPhone 6 (\$20.00) Telstra Screen Protector for iPhone 6 (\$4.55)
	iPad Mini 4 64GB	\$763.64	Nil	Standard iPad accessories in box (Nil Cost)

				Telstra iPad Air 2 Screen Protector (\$7.27)
	DREAMS Token	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Nil
	Telstra 4G Data Card	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Standard Telstra accessories in box (Nil Cost)
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra Leather Folio for iPhone 6 (\$20.00) Telstra Screen Protector for iPhone 6 (\$4.55)
	iPad Mini 4 64GB	\$763.64	Nil	Standard iPad accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra iPad Air 2 Screen Protector (\$7.27) Belkin iPad Air 2 Slim Style Keyboard Case (\$78.18)
	DREAMS Token	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Nil
Former Assistant Minister for Defence	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra Leather Folio for iPhone 6 (\$20.00) Telstra Screen Protector for iPhone 6 (\$4.55)

	DREAMS Token	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Nil
Assistant Minister for Defence	iPhone 6S 128GB	\$1,243.64	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost)
	iPad Air 2 64GB	\$807.27	Nil	Standard iPad accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra iPad Air 2 Screen Protector (\$7.27)
	DREAMS Token	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Nil
	HP Elite 820 Laptop	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	HP Laptop Bag (Nil Cost)
	Telstra 4G Data Card	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Standard Telstra accessories in box (Nil Cost)
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 Plus 64GB	\$1,178.18	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra Leather Folio for iPhone 6 Plus (\$20.91) Telstra Screen Protector for iPhone 6 Plus (\$5.45)
	DREAMS Token	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Nil

Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra Leather Folio for iPhone 6 (\$20.00) Telstra Screen Protector for iPhone 6 (\$4.55)
	DREAMS Token	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Nil
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra Leather Folio for iPhone 6 (\$20.00) Telstra Screen Protector for iPhone 6 (\$4.55)
	iPad Air 2 64GB	\$807.27	Nil	Standard iPad accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra iPad Air 2 Screen Protector (\$7.27) Belkin iPad Air 2 Slim Style Keyboard Case (\$78.18)
	DREAMS Token	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Nil
	HP Elite 820 Laptop	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	HP Laptop Bag (Nil Cost)
Ministerial Staff	iPhone 6 64GB	\$1,025.45	Nil	Standard iPhone accessories in box (Nil Cost)

				Telstra Leather Folio for iPhone 6 (\$20.00) Telstra Screen Protector for iPhone 6 (\$4.55)
	iPad Air 2 64GB	\$807.27	Nil	Standard iPad accessories in box (Nil Cost) Telstra iPad Air 2 Screen Protector (\$7.27) Belkin iPad Air 2 Slim Style Keyboard Case (\$78.18)
	DREAMS Token	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Nil
	HP Elite 820 Laptop	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	HP Laptop Bag (Nil Cost)
	Telstra 4G Data Card	Provided from existing departmental stock	Nil	Standard Telstra accessories in box (Nil Cost)

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Provision of equipment - Department

Question reference number: 119

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) Has electronic equipment (such as ipad, laptop, wireless card, vasco token, blackberry, mobile phone (list type if relevant), thumb drive, video cameras) been provided by the department/agency to departmental staff? If yes provide a list of:
- (b) What has been provided?
- (c) The purchase cost.
- (d) The ongoing cost.
- (e) A list of any accessories provided for the equipment and the cost of those accessories. (e.g. iPad keyboards, laptop carry bags, additional chargers etc).
- (f) A breakdown of what staff and staff classification receives each item.

Answer:

- (a) – (f) This question has been answered previously under Question on Notice No. 79 from Additional Estimates of 26 February 2014. This response remains extant.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: IT Equipment - Computers

Question reference number: 120

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) List the current inventory of computers owned, leased, stored, or able to be accessed by the Ministers office as provided by the department, listing the equipment cost and location and employment classification of the staff member that is allocated the equipment, or if the equipment is currently not being used
- (b) List the current inventory of computers owned, leased, stored, or able to be accessed by the department, listing the equipment cost and location
- (c) Please detail the operating systems used by the departments computers, the contractual arrangements for operating software and the on-going costs

Answer:

- (a) This question has been previously answered under Question on Notice No. 80 from Additional Estimates hearing of 26 February 2014. This response remains extant.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Departmental Travel Costs

Question reference number: 121

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) Is the minister or their office or their delegate required to approve all departmental and agency international travel?
- (b) If so, under what policy?
- (c) Provide a copy of that policy.
- (d) When was this policy implemented?
- (e) When is the minister notified, when is approval provided?
- (f) Detail all travel (domestic and international) for Departmental officers that accompanied the Minister and/or Parliamentary Secretary on their travel. Please include a total cost plus a breakdown that include airfares (and type of airfare), accommodation, meals and other travel expenses (such as incidentals).
- (g) Detail all travel for Departmental officers. Please include a total cost plus a breakdown that include airfares (and type of airfare), accommodation, meals and other travel expenses (such as incidentals). Also provide a reason and brief explanation for the travel.
- (h) What date was the minister or their office notified of the travel?
- (i) What date did the minister or their office approve the travel?
- (j) What travel is planned for the rest of this calendar year? Also provide a reason and brief explanation for the travel.

Answer:

- (a) No.
- (b) to (e) N/A.
- (f) Refer to Tables A and B attached.
- (g) As reflected in Defence's financial management systems, travel expenditure for Defence officers for the period 14 September 2015 to 31 January 2016 was approximately \$99.9 million. These figures represent the entire Defence workforce: APS employees, full-time ADF members, and ADF Reservists and encompasses operational, business, training, removal and condition of service leave associated travel. The figure does not represent charter aircraft used for

deployments and exercises. To provide the travel details requested, including the travel that is planned for the rest of this calendar year, would be an unreasonable diversion of departmental resources.

(h) and (i) N/A.

- (j) Travel plans for the remainder of the year are still in development and to attempt to detail these would be an unreasonable diversion of departmental resources.

Table A – International Travel

Minister / Parliamentary Secretary	Travel undertaken Destination, duration and purpose	Departmental ministerial costs (i) Gifts (ii) Security (iii) Portfolio costs to Defence (iv) Entertainment	Defence delegation	Defence personnel costs (i) Travel (ii) Accomm. (iii) Other
<i>Minister for Defence, Senator Payne</i>	<p>United States of America from 11 to 16 October 2015</p> <p>The Minister travelled to the United States of America to participate in the annual Australia-United States Ministerial Consultations (AUSMIN) and conduct bilateral engagement.</p> <p>The Minister was accompanied by two advisers and five Defence personnel.</p>	Nil	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Chief of the Defence Force (business class) Secretary of Defence (business class) Aide-de-Camp to the Minister for Defence (business class) Aide-de-Camp to the Chief of the Defence Force (business class) Communications Technician to the Chief of the Defence Force (business class) 	<p>(i) \$58,251.74</p> <p>(ii) \$14,985.09</p> <p>(iii) \$5,021.13</p>
<i>Minister for Defence, Senator Payne</i>	<p>Malaysia from 4 to 5 November 2015</p> <p>The Minister travelled to Malaysia to attend the ASEAN Defence Ministers' Meeting – Plus (ADMM-Plus) and conduct bilateral engagement.</p> <p>The Minister was accompanied by one adviser and three Defence personnel.</p>	<p>(i) \$</p> <p>(ii) \$</p> <p>(iii) \$18,867.00*</p> <p>(iv) \$</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Deputy Secretary Strategy (business class) Aide-de-Camp to the Minister for Defence (business class) Policy Officer - Regional Architecture (business class) 	<p>(i) \$15,232.35</p> <p>(ii) \$1,197.95</p> <p>(iii) \$1,082.76**</p>

Table A (cont)

Minister / Parliamentary Secretary	Travel undertaken Destination, duration and purpose	Departmental ministerial costs (i) Gifts (ii) Security (iii) Portfolio costs to Defence (iv) Entertainment	Defence delegation	Defence personnel costs (i) Travel (ii) Accomm. (iii) Other
<i>Minister for Defence, Senator Payne</i>	<p>New Zealand 14 December 2015</p> <p>The Minister travelled to New Zealand to attend a counterpart meeting.</p> <p>The Minister was accompanied by one adviser and four defence personnel. The delegation travelled to and from NZ in a single day on a Defence aircraft.</p>	Nil	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Secretary of Defence 2. CDF 3. Aide-de-Camp to the Minister for Defence 4. Communications Technician to the Chief of the Defence Force 	<p>(i) \$Nil</p> <p>(ii) \$Nil</p> <p>(iii) \$50.25</p>
<i>Minister for Defence, Senator Payne</i>	<p>France 19 to 22 January 2016</p> <p>The Minister travelled to France to attend the Counter-Daesh Ministerial Meeting and conduct bilateral engagement.</p> <p>The Minister was accompanied by two advisers and one defence staff member.</p>	Nil	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assistant Secretary Global Interests (business class) 	<p>(i) \$8,031.94</p> <p>(ii) \$1,033.89</p> <p>(iii) \$470.65</p>

Table A (cont)

Minister / Parliamentary Secretary	Travel undertaken Destination, duration and purpose	Departmental ministerial costs (i) Gifts (ii) Security (iii) Portfolio costs to Defence (iv) Entertainment	Defence delegation	Defence personnel costs (i) Travel (ii) Accomm. (iii) Other
<i>Minister for Defence Materiel and Science, Mr Brough</i>	Hawaii from 04 to 08 October 2015 The Minister travelled to Hawaii to attend the Australian American Leadership Dialogue. The Minister was accompanied by one adviser and one defence staff member.	(i) \$ (ii) \$ (iii) \$172.00*** (iv) \$	1. Aide-de-Camp (business class)	(i) \$ 5,790.07 (ii) \$3,128.20 (iii) \$1516.52

* Costs related to in-country transport, photographer, wreath, office set-up.

** ‘Other’ costs related to travel by then-Deputy Secretary Strategy were not available at the time of preparation.

*** Cost related to wreath.

Over the period 14 September 2015 to 26 February 2016, no international travel was undertaken by Assistant Minister Chester, Minister for Defence Materiel Tehan or Assistant Minister McCormack.

Table B – Domestic Travel

Office of the	Position	Start	Finish	City/Town	Accommodation	Airfares including taxes (economy class)	Ground Transportation	Meals & Incidentals	Miscellaneous travel costs	Official Hospitality	Total
Minister for Defence, SenatorPayne	Aide-de-Camp	02/10/2015	02/10/2015	Melbourne		303.27	115.98	46.20	27.00		446.25
		05/10/2015	7/10/2015	Melbourne Sydney	424.90	302.65	78.83	305.25	27.00		1138.63
		19/11/2015	22/11/2015	Sydney	818.45	214.47	127.64	498.58	11.50		1670.64
		4/12/2015	4/12/2015	Sydney		214.47	80.41	47.90	11.50		354.28
		21/12/2015	22/12/2015	Sydney	200.45	226.10	73.88	125.54	11.50		666.56
	Total				1443.8	1260.93	476.74	1023.47	88.5	0	4176.36
Minister for Defence Materiel and Science, Mr Brough	Aide-de-Camp	26/10/2015	26/10/2015	Sydney		658.82	10.60	46.20	70.73		786.35
		4/11/2015	4/11/2015	Amberley QLD		406.02	85.31	46.20	73.00		610.53
		7/12/2015	9/12/2015	Victoria	382.93	314.96	207.75	254.38	115.60		1275.62
		10/1/22015	10/12/2015	Amberley		406.02	93.17	47.90	39.00		586.09
Total					382.93	1785.82	396.83	394.68	298.33	0	3258.59
Minister for Defence, Senator	Acting Adviser	21/12/2015	21/12/2015	Sydney	200.45	226.10	73.88	125.54	11.50		666.56
Total					200.45	226.10	73.88	125.54	11.50	0	666.56



Senator the Hon Marise Payne
Minister for Defence

Parliament House
CANBERRA ACT 2600

MA16-002869



Telephone: 02 6277 7800

Senator Chris Back
Chair
Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade Legislation Committee
The Senate
CANBERRA ACT 2600

Chris
Dear Senator Back

I am writing to you to provide an amended response to Question on Notice 121, taken from the 10 February 2016 Additional Estimates hearing (tabled on 22 April 2016). This question relates to the Department of Defence's travel expenditure.

The question requested information on travel costs relating to training and relocations. This data was not provided in the original response provided to the committee, and has now been included in the amended response (attached).

It would be appreciated if you can please place the amended response (attached) in your records.

I have also provided a copy of this letter and the amended response to the Committee Secretariat.

Yours sincerely


MARISE PAYNE

Encl

28 OCT 2016

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

Revised response to Question Reference 121 part (g)

As reflected in Defence's financial management systems, the travel expenditure for Defence officers for the period 14 September 2015 to 31 January 2016 is outlined in the table below. The figures do not represent charter aircraft used for deployments and exercises.

The table below is presented on a cash spent basis.

Expenditure category	14 Sept 2015 to 31 Jan 2016 \$m
Business Travel - Domestic	45.2
Business Travel - Overseas	21.4
<i>Total business travel</i>	<i>66.6</i>
Exercise Travel	11.7
ADF Conditions of Service Travel	21.6
ADF Training Related Travel	31.9
APS Training Related Travel	3.3
Removals Related Travel	22.1
Total Travel	157.2

To provide the travel details requested, including the travel that is planned for the rest of this calendar year, would be an unreasonable diversion of departmental resources.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Departmental Grants

Question reference number: 122

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) What guidelines are in place to administer grants?
- (b) How are grants applied for?
- (c) Are there any restrictions on who can apply for a grant? If yes, please detail.
 - (i) Can these restrictions be waived? If yes, please detail the process for waving them and list any grants where the restrictions were waived.
- (d) What is the procedure for selecting who will be awarded a grant?
- (e) Who is involved in this selection process?
- (f) Does the minister or the minister's office play any role in awarding grants? If yes, please detail.
 - (i) Has the minister or the minister's office exercised or attempted to exercise any influence over the awarding of any grants? If yes, please detail.
- (g) Provide a list of all grants, including ad hoc, one-off discretionary grants awarded to date. Provide the recipients, amount, intended use of the grants, what locations have benefited from the grants and the electorate and state of those locations.
- (h) Update the status of each grant that was approved prior to the specified period, but did not have financial contracts in place at that time. Provide details of the recipients, the amount, the intended use of the grants, what locations have benefited from the grants and the electorate and state of those grants.

Answer:

- (a) This question has been previously answered under Question on Notice No. 145 from Budget Estimates Hearing on 22 October 2014. This response remains extant.

- (b) This question has been previously answered under Question on Notice No. 145 from Budget Estimates Hearing on 22 October 2014. This response remains extant, with the addition that applications for the New Air Combat Capability Industry Support Program (NACC-ISP) are submitted to the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science (DIIS).
- (c)(i) See response to question (a) above. In the case of the NACC-ISP grant program, it is restricted to companies participating in the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) supply chain (and are not a JSF prime contractor).
- (d) The procedures for selecting who will be awarded a grant are:
- The Minister for Defence is the decision making authority for grants made by Defence, with grant applications being reviewed and recommended by the relevant program area (the Chief Finance Officer Group provides a policy clearance and co-ordination role in the grants process).
 - Skilling Australia's Defence Industry (SADI): The SADI Program is administered by the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science (DIIS) and the grant application is reviewed by the relevant program area and a recommendation is made to the SADI Program delegate within DIIS. The Defence Minister has delegated the authority for awarding grants for this program to departmental officials in Defence and the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science.
 - New Air Combat Capability-Industry Support Program (NACC-ISP): Each grant application is reviewed by the Joint Strike Fighter Division and a recommendation, through the NACC-ISP Review Panel, is made to the program delegate (Air Vice-Marshal JSF Division) as the decision making authority for NACC-ISP grants.
- (e) In general, departmental staff, both Australian Public Service and Australian Defence Force personnel, can be involved in the review process. In some cases external personnel are involved in the assessment and recommendation processes. Applications are processed through the relevant Service Chiefs or Group Heads, the Chief Finance Officer Group, the Chief of Defence Force and the Secretary of Defence prior to being approved by the Minister for Defence.

The Department of Industry, Innovation and Science (DIIS) holds the delegation in the selection process for SADI.

In the case of NACC-ISP, companies applying for a grant must demonstrate their eligibility and merit for the grant as outlined within the Program Guidelines. Compliance with the eligibility criteria is assessed by DIIS, who support Defence in administering the grant program. The response to the merit criteria is assessed by an independent panel made up of representatives from Defence and DIIS.

- (f)(i) The Minister is the approving authority for grants made in Defence except where authority has been delegated.

- (g) The tables below contain lists of all grants, including ad hoc, one-off discretionary grants and grant programs awarded from 14 September 2015 to 1 March 2016.

Ad hoc Grants

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
Multinational Force and Observers	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	USD 2,000,000	Strategy Support	Operation MAZURKA	Overseas	
Australian PeaceKeeping Memorial Project	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$2,200,000.00	Locations of Significance to the Australian Defence Force. Establishment of Memorial on Anzac Parade.	Canberra	Fenner	ACT
National Boer War Memorial Project	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$1,595,000.00	Locations of Significance to the Australian Defence Force. Establishment of Memorial on Anzac Parade.	Canberra	Fenner	ACT
Institute for Regional Security	The Hon. Marise Payne	\$143,000.00	Support for Kokoda Foundation - Independent Research on Australia's Security.	Canberra	Canberra	ACT
Institute for Regional Security	The Hon. Marise Payne	\$33,000.00	Support for Young Leaders Strategic Forum	Canberra	Canberra	ACT

SADI Program

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
STEYR MOTORS AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$7,222.60	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Stafford	Brisbane	QLD
CIRRUS REAL TIME PROCESSING SYSTEMS PTY LIMITED	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$5,940.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Surry Hills	Sydney	NSW

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
TAYLOR BROS. MARINE PTY. LTD.	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$36,300.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Derwent Park	Denison	TAS
HEAT TREATMENT (QLD) PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$75,073.83	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Coopers Plains	Moreton	QLD
HTA (VIC) Pty Ltd	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$55,000.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Coopers Plains	Moreton	QLD
THYSSENKRUPP MARINE SYSTEMS AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$7,920.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Port Melbourne	Melbourne Ports	VIC
SEA BOX INTERNATIONAL PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$15,598.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Fyshwick	Canberra	ACT
DARONMONT TECHNOLOGIES PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$33,195.80	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Burwood	Chisholm	VIC

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
ACACIA RESEARCH PTY. LTD.	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$7,931.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Hendon	Port Adelaide	SA
ATSA DEFENCE SERVICES PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$9,779.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Thornton	Newcastle	NSW
GEORGE LOVITT (MANUFACTURING) PROPRIETARY LIMITED	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$18,700.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Montmorency	Jagajaga	VIC
MARAND PRECISION ENGINEERING PTY. LTD.	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$123,024.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Moorabbin	Hotham	VIC
MMC ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$89,544.40	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Henderson	Fremantle	WA
MILSPEC MANUFACTURING PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$145,770.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Albury	Farrer	NSW

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
THALES AUSTRALIA LIMITED	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$148,960.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Sydney Olympic Park	Reid	NSW
LEVETT ENGINEERING PTY. LTD.	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$86,240.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Elizabeth South	Wakefield	SA
BERKELEY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$67,397.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Sydney	Sydney	NSW
BIRDON PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$34,100.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Port Macquarie	Lyne	NSW
CULL HOLDINGS PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$13,200.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Henderson	Fremantle	WA
AIR AFFAIRS (AUSTRALIA) PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$66,572.09	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Yerriyong	Gilmore	NSW

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
XTEK LIMITED	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$18,649.40	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Fyshwick	Canberra	ACT
SPIRAL SYSTEMS PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$15,378.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Oakleigh South	Hotham	VIC
H.I. FRASER PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$131,607.30	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Warriewood	Mackellar	NSW
HEAVYMECH PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$22,000.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Northfield	Adelaide	SA
JENKINS ENGINEERING DEFENCE SYSTEMS PTY. LTD.	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$31,124.59	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Matraville	Kingsford Smith	NSW
MOOG AUSTRALIA PROPRIETARY LIMITED	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$31,350.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Mulgrave	Bruce	VIC

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
RUAG AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$173,463.93	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Bayswater	Aston	VIC
INTEGRATED DESIGN & ENGINEERING SOLUTIONS PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$26,312.10	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Clayton South	Hotham	VIC
AQUILA ENGINEERING PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$13,621.12	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Sale	Gippsland	VIC
BABCOCK PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$104,148.04	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Osborne	Port Adelaide	SA
SYPAQ SYSTEMS PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$41,914.99	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Melbourne	Port Melbourne	VIC
CAE AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$220,000.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Silverwater	Reid	NSW

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
ELMTEK PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$83,694.60	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Mawson Lakes	Makin	SA
K2 TECHNOLOGY PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$15,600.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	East Perth	Perth	WA
RHEINMETALL MAN MILITARY VEHICLES AUSTRALIA	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$85,462.30	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Melbourne	Melbourne	VIC
ZANGOLD PTY LTD (EXPLOSIVE PROTECTION EQUIPMENT)	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$160,454.80	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Fortitude Valley	Brisbane	QLD
FORTITUDE EAST PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$33,495.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Coburg North	Scullin	VIC
HIDE AWAY SAFE SECURITIES PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$55,440.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Wangaratta	Indi	VIC

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
PEL-AIR AVIATION PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$2,200.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Mascot	Kingsford Smith	NSW
COMTECH INDUSTRIES PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$15,235.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	DARRA	Oxley	QLD
SIKORSKY AIRCRAFT AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$9,900.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Eagle Farm	Lilley	QLD
QINETIQ PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$30,091.60	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Canberra Airport	Fraser	ACT
JAMES FISHER AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$21,017.70	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Bibra Lake	Fremantle	WA
BOEING DEFENCE AUSTRALIA LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$45,100.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Brisbane	Brisbane	QLD

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
FERRA ENGINEERING PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$78,452.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Tingalpa	Bonner	QLD
SHOAL ENGINEERING PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$87,965.02	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Port Adelaide	Port Adelaide	SA
ROCKWELL COLLINS AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$27,563.93	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Lane Cove West	North Sydney	NSW
NIOA NOMINEES PTY LTD T/F BILL NIOA FAMILY TRUST	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$27,280.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Eagle Farm	Lilley	QLD
BMT DESIGN & TECHNOLOGY PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$71,151.33	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Melbourne	Melbourne	VIC
CONSUNET PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$17,424.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Thebarton	Hindmarsh	SA

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
L-3 COMMUNICATIONS OCEANIA PTY Ltd Communications Oceania Pty Limited	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$6,336.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	North Sydney	North Sydney	NSW
TAE GAS TURBINES PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$114,134.79	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Amberley	Blair	QLD
RAY FRY INVESTMENTS PTY. LTD.	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$12,680.01	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Portsmith	Leichhardt	QLD
MICREO LIMITED	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$80,210.25	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Eight Mile Plains	Moreton	QLD
LINTEK PTY. LIMITED	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$61,043.93	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Queanbeyan	Eden-Monaro	NSW
CEA TECHNOLOGIES PTY LIMITED	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$129,395.66	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Fyshwick	Canberra	ACT

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
MARITIME ENGINEERS PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$37,363.19	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Fremantle	Fremantle	WA
OCEAN SOFTWARE PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$53,996.16	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Melbourne	Melbourne	VIC
NOVA DEFENCE PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$95,793.72	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Mile End South	Adelaide	SA
MARSHALL AEROSPACE AUSTRALIA PTY LIMITED	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$7,492.17	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Richmond	Macquarie	NSW
TRINITY FIRE SERVICES PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$11,021.14	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Bungalow	Leichardt	QLD
IKAD ENGINEERING PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$66,000.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Henderson	Fremantle	WA

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
QUICKSTEP TECHNOLOGIES PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$110,000.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	North Coogee	Fremantle	WA
FIRE CONTROL SYSTEMS PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$9,883.50	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Weston Creek	Canberra	ACT
R.G.M. MAINTENANCE PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$96,156.50	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Winnellie	Solomon	NT
MULTIMATIC ENGINEERING AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$65,065.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Scoresby	Aston	VIC
EXELIS C4i PTY LTDE	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$25,027.20	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Melbourne	Melbourne	VIC
BALE DEFENCE INDUSTRIES	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$13,200.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Port Macquarie	Lyne	NSW

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
CHEMRING AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$41,700.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Lara	Corio	VIC
SENTIENT VISION SYSTEMS PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$11,000.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Port Melbourne	Melbourne Ports	VIC
SAAB AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$61,465.99	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Mawson Lakes	Makin	SA
LOCKHEED MARTIN AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$56,635.83	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Kingston	Canberra	ACT
LOGISTIC ENGINEERING SERVICES PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$21,588.64	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Port Melbourne	Melbourne Ports	VIC
AGENT ORIENTED SOFTWARE PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$68,714.13	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Melbourne	Melbourne	VIC

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
AEROSONDE PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$42,240.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Notting Hill	Chisholm	VIC
E M SOLUTIONS PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$40,447.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Yeronga	Moreton	QLD
FAVCOTE PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$127,133.60	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Austral	Fowler	NSW
PMB DEFENCE ENGINEERING PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$13,612.50	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Osborne	Port Adelaide	SA
AIRFLITE PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$54,144.20	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Perth Airport	Swan	WA
BEAK ENGINEERING PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$7,590.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Dandenong	Isaacs	VIC

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
GENERAL DYNAMICS LAND SYSTEMS - AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$59,647.01	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Pooraka	Port Adelaide	SA
GPSAT SYSTEMS AUSTRALIA PTY. LTD.	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$19,767.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Macleod	Jagajaga	VIC
PENSKE POWER SYSTEMS PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$92,400.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Chipping Norton	Fowler	NSW
ASC PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$180,593.35	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Osborne	Port Adelaide	SA
PACIFIC AEROSPACE CONSULTING PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$1,817.20	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Coomera	Forde	QLD
CONSILIUM TECHNOLOGY PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$16,588.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Adelaide	Adelaide	SA

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
DMS MARITIME Pty Limited T/A SERCO DEFENCE	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$227,040.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Sydney	Sydney	NSW
HAWKER PACIFIC PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$2,948.14	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Bankstown Aerodrome	Banks	NSW
METROMATICS PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$69,121.80	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	North Lakes	Petrie	QLD
SONARTECH ATLAS PTY LIMITED	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$44,148.50	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Macquarie Park	Bennelong	NSW
BAE SYSTEMS AUSTRALIA DEFENCE PTY LIMITED	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$114,180.00	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Edinburgh Parks	Wakefield	SA
BAE SYSTEMS AUSTRALIA DEFENCE PTY LIMITED	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$113,810.02	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Edinburgh Parks	Wakefield	SA

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
SUPACAT PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$112,357.97	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Port Melbourne	Melbourne Ports	VIC
JACOBS AUSTRALIA PTY LIMITED	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$54,501.19	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Canberra	Canberra	ACT
RAYTHEON AUSTRALIA PTY LTD	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$94,242.50	Provide financial support for training and skilling activities in trade, technical or professional skill sets that are required to meet a current or future Defence capability need.	Canberra Airport	Fraser	ACT

Industry Skilling Programme Enhancement-School Pathways Programme (ISPE-SPP)

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
Regional Development Australia – Hunter Incorporated 65 229 482 135	Director Industry Skilling & Pathways Programs, (ISPP)	\$619,300.01	To raise students' awareness of possible career opportunities and knowledge of Defence and defence industry pathways whilst increasing the number of students undertaking Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics subjects in participating schools.	Hunter Region	Newcastle	NSW

New Air Combat Capability – Industry Support Program

Name of Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
AW Bell Pty Ltd	Program Manager Joint Strike Fighter	\$250,000	Enhancement of technical and manufacturing capability to support F-35 component manufacture for Northrop Grumman and BAE Systems	Dandenong South	Issacs	VIC
Heat Treatment (Qld) Pty Ltd	Program Manager Joint Strike Fighter	\$1,000,000	Establish next generation thermal processing facility for F-35 Program including significant capacity increase to aluminium vacuum brazing.	Coopers Plains	Moreton	QLD
Heat Treatment (Qld) Pty Ltd	Program Manager Joint Strike Fighter	\$1,000,000	Increased capability through vacuum carburising, vacuum hardening, neutral hardening, Super alloy steel processing and titanium processing.	Coopers Plains	Moreton	QLD

- (h) The tables below contain details of previously approved grants, approved prior to the specified period, but which did not have financial contracts in place at that time.

Family Support Funding Program

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
Shoalhaven Defence Families Association	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$120,100.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Nowra	Gilmore	NSW
Network Tindal Incorporated	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$140,850.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Tindal	Lingiari	NT
Larrakeyah Neighbourhood House	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$128,400.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Larrakeyah	Solomon	NT
Robertson Barracks Family Group	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$126,000.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Robertson Barracks	Solomon	NT
Top Ender Tri Services Magazine Inc	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$186,400.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Darwin	Solomon	NT
Power Community	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$148,320.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Alberton	Port Adelaide	SA
Dowsing Point Community Centre	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$85,045.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Dowsing Point	Denison	TAS
Bandiana Neighbourhood House	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$132,213.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Bandiana	Indi	Vic
Necana Association	The Hon. Kevin	\$99,142.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families	Wodonga	Indi	Vic

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
	Andrews		and local communities			
Australian Military Wives Choir Canberra Incorporated	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$11,555.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Brisbane, Townsville Sydney West	Fenner	ACT
Duntroon Community Centre Incorporated	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$48,057.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Duntroon	Fenner	ACT
Gungahlin Defence Families Playgroup	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$3,375.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Nicholls, Canberra	Fenner	ACT
Solid Rock	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$8,500.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Canberra	Fenner	ACT
Waratah Interest Group	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$43,600.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Holsworthy	Hughes	NSW
Anklebiters Playgroup	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$2,000.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Randwick	Kingsford Smith	NSW
Williamstown Craft Group	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$5,185.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Williamstown	Newcastle / Patterson	NSW
Williamstown Playgroup	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$6,450.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Williamstown	Newcastle	NSW
Williamstown Pre School Inc	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$5,910.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Williamstown	Newcastle / Port Stephens	NSW
Williamstown Umbrella Support Group	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$5,800.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Williamstown	Newcastle / Patterson	NSW
Kissingpoint Cottage	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$36,950.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Dundas	Parramatta	NSW
Blamey Community Group	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$47,400.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Kapooka	Riverina	NSW
Forest Hill Defence Community Group Inc	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$20,300.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Wagga Wagga	Riverina	NSW
Riverina Community College	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$29,000.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Wagga Wagga	Riverina	NSW
North West Disability Services Inc	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$16,500.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Baulkham Hills	The Hills Shire	NSW
The Junction Works Ltd	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$30,481.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Austral	Werriwa	NSW
Mission Australia	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$27,082.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Katherine	Lingiari	NT

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
Billeroy Road Community Centre	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$38,700.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Darwin	Solomon	NT
Grow	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$7,393.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Darwin	Solomon	NT
Playgroup of the Northern Territory	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$31,715.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Marrara	Solomon	NT
Gallipoli Barracks Community Centre	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$18,450.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Ennoggera	Brisbane	QLD
Big Brothers Big Sisters Australia	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$29,150.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Lawnton	Dickson	QLD
Toowoomba Defence Families Support Association	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$31,962.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Toowoomba	Groom	QLD
Centacare North Queensland	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$18,676.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Cranbrook	Herbert	QLD
Hinchinbrook Chamber of Commerce, Industry & Tourism Inc	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$50,000.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Ingham	Kennedy	QLD
Little Diggers	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$38,750.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Manoora	Leichardt	QLD
My Space Inc	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$60,000.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Parramatta Park	Leichardt	QLD
Autism Queensland Limited	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$17,660.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Sunnybank Hills	Moreton	QLD
Playgroup Queensland	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$26,478.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Enoggera	Ryan	QLD
Port Moresby Australian Defence Families Club	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$9,450.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Waigani	Papua New Guinea	Overseas
YWCA of Adelaide	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$21,922.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Adelaide	Adelaide	SA
Woodside Defence Families Association	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$9,875.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Woodside	Mayo	SA
North East Defence Community Incorporated	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$42,890.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	RAAF Base Edinburgh	Wakefield	SA
Cerberus Cottage Family & Friends Inc	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$42,714.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	HMAS Cerberus	Flinders	VIC
East Sale Family Group Inc	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$50,450.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	RAAF Base East Sale	Gippsland	VIC

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
Mactier Community Centre	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$43,185.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Watsonia	Jaga Jaga	VIC
Puckapunyal & District Neighbourhood Centre Inc	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$46,950.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Puckapunyal	McEwen	VIC
Puckapunyal Kindergarten Association Incorporated	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$37,350.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Puckapunyal	McEwen	VIC
Puckapunyal Tallarook Junior Netball/Football Club	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$2,000.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Puckapunyal	McEwen	VIC
Marilla House Community Centre	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$41,900.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Rockingham	Brand	WA
Karrakatta Community House	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$16,477.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Karrakatta	Curtin	WA
Special Air Services Regiment Auxiliary Incorporated	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$37,000.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Swanbourne	Curtin	WA
Pilbara Regiment Family Group	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$12,230.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Karratha	Durack	WA
Pearce Community Toy Library and Social Group	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$2,000.00	Support for Defence personnel, their families and local communities	Bullsbrook	Pearce	WA

Australian Army History Unit Program

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
Justin Chadwick	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$6,500.00	Research Expenses	Kensington Park	Sturt	SA
Monique Dolak	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$7,077.00	Research Expenses	London	Overseas	
Ian Frazer	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$4,887.00	Research Expenses	London	Overseas	
Colin Garnett	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$4,400.00	Research Expenses	Canberra Wellington, NZ	Canberra Overseas	ACT
Tim Gellel	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$6,500.00	Research Expenses	Canberra Port Moresby & Alotau - PNG	Canberra Overseas	ACT
Ian Howie-Willis	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$2,510.00	Research Expenses	Canberra London	Canberra Overseas	ACT
Michael Kelly	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$9,950.00	Research Expenses	Canberra Washington DC London Wellington & Waiouru NZ	Canberra Overseas Overseas Overseas	ACT

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
Robert Stevenson	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$6,250.00	Research Expenses	Canberra Washington DC Port Moresby & Kokopo - PNG	Canberra Overseas Overseas	ACT
Craig Stockings	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$10,669.00	Research Expenses	Canberra New York	Canberra Overseas	ACT

Ad Hoc / Discretionary Grants

Grant Recipient	Approved	Amount of Grant	Intended use of the grant	What locations have benefited from the grants	The electorate	State
China Matters LTD	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$100,000.00	Defence Policy Research Expenses	Pymont	Sydney	NSW
Stand Tall for PTS	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$150,000.00	International Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Forum	South Brisbane	Griffith	QLD
Australian Strategic Policy Institute	The Hon. Kevin Andrews	\$10,328,000.00	Defence Policy Research Expenses	Canberra	Canberra	ACT

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Departmental Rebranding

Question reference number: 123

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: Has the department/Agency undergone a name change or any other form of rebranding? If so:

- (a) Please detail why this name change / rebrand were considered necessary and a justified use of departmental funds?
 - (i) Please provide a copy of any reports that were commissioned to study the benefits and costs associated with the rebranding.
- (b) Please provide the total cost associated with this rebrand and then break down by amount spent replacing:
 - (i) Signage.
 - (ii) Stationery (please include details of existing stationery and how it was disposed of)
 - (iii) Logos
 - (iv) Consultancy
 - (v) Any relevant IT changes.
 - (vi) Office reconfiguration.
- (c) How was the decision reached to rename and/or rebrand the department?
 - (i) Who was involved in reaching this decision?
 - (ii) Please provide a copy of any communication (including but not limited to emails, letters, memos, notes etc) from within the department, or between the department and the government regarding the rename/rebranding.

Answer:

(a) to (c) Please refer to Question on Notice No.151 from Budget Estimates of 2 and 3 June 2014. This response remains extant.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Media Monitoring Services

Question reference number: 124

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015

- (1) What was the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the Minister's office during the specified period?
 - (a) Which agency or agencies provided these services?
 - (b) What has been spent providing these services during the specified period?
 - (c) Itemise these expenses.
- (2) What was the total cost of media monitoring services, including press clippings, electronic media transcripts etcetera, provided to the department/agency during the specified period?
 - (a) Which agency or agencies provided these services?
 - (b) What has been spent providing these services during the specified period?
 - (c) Itemise these expenses

Answer:

(1) and (2) (a) iSentia is contracted by the Department of Defence to provide Media Monitoring services.

(1) and (2) (b) The Department of Defence has incurred a total cost of \$535,870.47 for the period 14 September 2015 to 10 February 2016 for Media Monitoring Services, including press clippings and electronic media transcripts. This contract provides unlimited access to over 90,000 staff in Defence. This number includes Ministerial staff.

(1) and (2) (c) not applicable.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Ministerial Procedure Manuals

Question reference number: 125

Senator/Member: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

1. Does the minister's office have a procedure manual for communication between the minister's office and the department? If yes, please provide a copy and:
2. When was the manual last updated?
3. Who is responsible for updating the manual?
4. Who is the manual distributed to?
5. Is anyone responsible for clearing communications before they are sent to the department?

Answer:

(1) to (5) These questions have been previously answered under Question on Notice No. 82 from Supplementary Budget Estimates of 22 October 2014. This response remains extant.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Enterprise Bargaining Agreements

Question reference number: 126

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) Please list all related EBAs with coverage of the department.
- (b) Please list their starting and expiration dates.
- (c) What is the current status of negotiations for the next agreement/s? Please detail.

Answer:

- (a) Defence has one enterprise agreement under the Fair Work Act that covers all non-SES APS employees in the Department, the Defence Enterprise Collective Agreement (DECA) 2012 – 2014.
- (b) DECA 2012 – 2014 became operational on 19 April 2012 and nominally expired on 30 June 2014.
- (c) An employee vote for the proposed Defence Enterprise Agreement 2016-2019 was conducted 25 February – 1 March 2016. The majority of employees did not support the enterprise agreement with 50.91% of employees voting 'No'.

Defence returned to bargaining with unions and employee representatives on 5 April in Adelaide. A further bargaining meeting was held on 8 April in Melbourne. Bargaining has now concluded.

The Australian Public Service Commissioner has approved the proposed Agreement.

The proposed Agreement has been made available to staff and 80 information sessions are being held across Defence sites.

A vote is scheduled for 28 April to 3 May.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Existing Resource Programs

Question reference number: 127

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question: Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September 2015:

- (a) How many projects, work, programs or other tasks has the department started as a consequence of government policies or priorities that are required to be funded 'within existing resources'?
- (b) List each
- (c) List the staffing assigned to each task
- (d) What is the nominal total salary cost of the officers assigned to the project?
- (e) What resources or equipment has been assigned to the project?

Answer:

(a), (b) and (e) The reconciliation of Defence Departmental funding from 2016 Defence White Paper to the 2016-17 Budget is reported at Tables 3 and 4 of the *Portfolio Budget Statements 2016-17*.

(c) and (d) Due to the breadth and complexity of the question, an unreasonable diversion of departmental resources would be required to develop a response.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Conditions of Government Contracts and Agreements

Question reference number: 128

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) Do any contracts managed by the Department/Agency contain any limitations or restrictions on advocacy or criticising Government policy? If so, please name each contract. When was it formed or created?
- (b) What are the specific clauses and/or sections which state this, or in effect, create a limitation or restriction?
- (c) Do any agreements managed by the Department/Agency contain any limitations on restrictions on advocacy or criticisms of Government policy? If so, please name each agreement. When was it formed or created?
- (d) What are the specific clauses and/or sections which state this, or in effect, create a limitation or restriction?
- (e) For each of the contracts and agreements, are there any particular reason, such as genuine commercial in confidence information, for this restriction?
- (f) Have any changes to financial or resource support to services which advocate on behalf of groups or individuals in Australian society been made? If so, which groups? What was the change?
- (g) Has any consultation occurred between the Department/Agency and any individuals and/or community groups about these changes? If so, what consultation process was used? Was it public? If not, why not? Are public submissions available on a website?
- (h) If no consultation has occurred, why not?
- (i) Did the Minister/Parliamentary Secretary meet with any stakeholders about changes to advocacy in their contracts and/or agreements? If so, when? Who did he/she meet with?

Answer:

(a), (c) and (f) None to the Department's knowledge.

(b), (d), (e), (g) to (i) Not applicable.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates –10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Statutory Review Provisions

Question reference number: 129

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Please list all current legislation, covered by the department's portfolio, which contain a statutory review provision/s. For each, please provide:

- (1) What work has been done towards preparing for the review? If none, why not?
- (2) Please provide a schedule or a workplan for the review
- (3) When did/will this work begin?
- (4) When is/was the review due to commence.
- (5) What is the expected report date?
- (6) Who is the minister responsible for the review?
- (7) What department is responsible for the review?
- (8) List the specific clauses or legislation under review caused by the statutory provision.
- (9) List the terms of reference.
- (10) What is the scope of the review?
- (11) Who is conducting the review. How were they selected? What are the legislated obligation for the selection of the person to conduct the review?
- (12) What is the budgeted, projected or expected costs of the review
- (13) When was the Minister briefed on this matter?
- (14) What decision points are upcoming for the minister on this matter?
- (15) List the number of officers, and their classification level, involved in conducting the review
- (16) Will the report will be tabled in parliament or made public. If so, when

Answer:

(1) to (16) There is no current legislation covered by Defence that contains statutory review provisions.

Sentate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Budget Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Sunset Provisions

Question reference number: 130

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) Please list all current legislation, covered by the department's portfolio, which contain a sunset provision/s. For each, please provide:
 - (i) What work has been done towards preparing for the activation of sunset provisions? If no work has commenced, why not?
 - (ii) Has any consideration been given to delaying or alerting the sunset provisions?
 - (iii) Please provide a schedule or a workplan for the sunset provisions becoming active
 - (iv) When did/will this work begin?
- (b) Will there be any reviews of or relating to the legislation before or after the sunset provision is enacted? If yes:
 - (i) When is/was the review due to commence.
 - (ii) What is the expected report date.
 - (iii) Who is the minister responsible for the review
 - (iv) What department is responsible for the review
 - (v) List the specific clauses or legislation under review caused by the statutory provision.
 - (vi) List the terms of reference.
 - (vii) What is the scope of the review.
 - (viii) Who is conducting the review. How were they selected? What are the legislated obligation for the selection of the person to conduct the review?
 - (ix) What is the budgeted, projected or expected costs of the review?
 - (x) When was the Minister briefed on this matter?
 - (xi) What decision points are upcoming for the minister on this matter?
 - (xii) List the number of officers, and their classification level, involved in conducting the review
 - (xiii) Will the report will be tabled in parliament or made public. If so, when?

Answer:

- (a) – (b) There is no current legislation covered by Defence that contains a sunset provision.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Legal Costs

Question reference number: 131

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) List all legal costs incurred by the department or agency
- (b) List the total cost for these items, broken down by source of legal advice, hours retained or taken to prepare the advice and the level of counsel used in preparing the advice, whether the advice was internal or external
- (c) List cost spend briefing Counsel, broken down by hours spent briefing, whether it was direct or indirect briefing, the gender ratio of Counsel, how each Counsel was engaged (departmental, ministerial)
- (d) How was each piece of advice procured? Detail the method of identifying legal advice

Answer:

(a) and (b) The Department of Defence's legal expenditure (GST Exclusive) for the period 14 September 2015 to 29 February 2016 was \$27,878,939.61, broken down as follows:

- Internal Expenditure \$19,478,241.37
- External Expenditure \$8,400,698.24

The Capability Acquisition and Sustainment Group's legal expenditure for the same period was \$7,490,097.86, broken down as follows:

- Internal Expenditure \$952,043.56
- External Expenditure \$6,538,054.30

Internal legal expenditure cannot be broken down into the categories requested due to the configuration of Defence systems. Likewise, to break down external expenditure to the degree requested would require an excessive diversion of resources. Therefore the response has been provided in the format approved for the Office of Legal Services Coordination annual Certificate of Compliance under the Legal Services Direction, which Defence's systems have been configured to support.

External expenditure by the Department of Defence, broken down by service provider, was as follows:

Ashurst	\$589,635.93
Australian Government Solicitor	\$1,053,689.99
Clayton Utz	\$1,684,018.22
Coors Chambers Westgarth	\$27,957.11
DLA Piper	\$502,898.26
FAL Lawyers	\$3,057.02
Henry Davis York	\$813,462.56
HWL Ebsworth	\$286,012.07
Jeffery Paul Phillips	\$111,198.85
K and L Gates	\$14,405.00
Kelly Hazell Quill Lawyers	\$3,525.00
King Wood Mallesons	\$704,398.07
Lander and Rogers	\$55,915.43
Maddocks	\$113,285.10
McInnes Wilson Lawyers	\$224.00
Meyer Vandenberg Lawyers	\$14,740.04
Mills Oakley Lawyers	\$73,530.50
Minter Ellison	\$443,585.86
Moray and Agnew	\$123,353.00
Norton Rose Fullbright	\$413,088.14
Proximity Legal	\$13,464.00
Roberts Nehmer McKee Lawyers	\$4,488.55
Russell Kennedy	\$48,405.00
Salvos Legal	\$19,015.75
Sparke Helmore	\$46,908.45
TressCox Lawyers	\$18,671.14
Disbursements – total value including counsel	\$817,765.20

External expenditure by the Capability Acquisition and Sustainment Group, broken down by service provider, was as follows:

Ashurst	\$865,629.69
Australian Government Solicitor	\$747,636.00
Clayton Utz	\$2,601,628.18
DLA Piper	\$602,669.70
Henry Davis York	\$21,767.00
King & Wood Mallesons	\$465,892.03
Maddocks	\$4,407.00
Minter Ellison	\$2,734.90
Proximity Legal	\$128,139.27
Sparke Helmore	\$1,097,550.54

(c) The Department of Defence's expenditure on Counsel (GST Exclusive) for the period 14 September 2015 to 29 February 2016 was \$254,960.64. This figure is included in the total external legal expenditure reported in part (a). The Capability Acquisition & Sustainment Group's expenditure on Counsel (GST Exclusive) for the same period was \$50,780.11.

To break this figure down by hours spent briefing would require an unreasonable diversion of resources. For Counsel paid by Defence in this period, two were briefed directly and ten were briefed indirectly. Payments totalling \$1,057.84 were made to one female counsel and payments totalling \$253,902.80 were made to 11 male counsel. For Counsel paid by Capability Acquisition & Sustainment Group in this period, two were briefed indirectly. Payments totalling \$50,780.11 were made to two male counsel.

All counsel were engaged through the process detailed under Question on Notice No. 128 from Budget Estimates of 2 and 3 June 2014.

(d) Please refer to Question on Notice No. 128 from Additional Estimates of 26 February 2014. This response remains extant.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Vending Machines

Question reference number: 132

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: Has the department/agency purchased or leased or taken under contract any vending machine facilities?

- (a) If so, list these.
- (b) If so, list the total cost for these items.
- (c) If so, list the itemised cost for each item of expenditure.
- (d) If so, where were these purchased?
- (e) If so, list the process for identifying how they would be purchased.
- (f) If so, what is the current location for these items?
- (g) If so, what is the current usage for each of these items?

Answer:

(a) to (g) No.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Self Initiated Work

Question reference number: 133

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) Does the department have a program for staff to engage in self-initiated work (projects, plans etc that are devised by staff without being directed by the minister's office or department management)?
- (b) Please list all ongoing projects. For each, please detail:
- (c) When did the project commence?
- (d) When is it expected to conclude?
- (e) What will the total cost of the project be?
- (f) Where did the money for the project come from?
- (g) Where is the project based?

Answer:

(a) to (g) Please refer to Question on Notice No. 75 from Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing of 22 October 2014. This response remains extant.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Staff Awards

Question reference number: 134

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (1) Has the Department / Agency given out awards to staff for any reason? If yes:
 - (a) What was the reason for the awards?
 - (b) What was the criteria for the awards?
 - (c) What form did the award take? (e.g. Certificate, gift vouchers etc)
 - (d) How much was spent on the award?
- (2) How were the awards presented?
- (3) Who presented the awards?
- (4) Was there a ceremony or party for the awards? If yes:
 - (a) Where was it held?
 - (b) Was there a fee for the venue?
 - (c) If yes, how much?
 - (d) How much was spent on catering?
 - (e) How many people attended?
 - (f) Did the minister attend?
 - (g) Did the minister's staff attend? If yes, how many?

Answer:

- (1) to (4) Defence has a number of Honours, Decorations, Commendations and Awards that are presented to both employees of the Australian Public Service and members of the Australian Defence Force throughout the year. Honours, Decorations, Commendations and Awards include, but are not limited to:
- Nominations for the Australia Day and Queen's Birthday Honours list, including for the Public Service Medal;
 - Commendations, which are awarded within each Group and Service; and

- Military Awards, including medals, citations, commendations and badges, which are awarded in accordance with the Australian and Imperial Honours and Awards system.

Further information on Defence Honours and Awards can be found at the following link: <http://www.defence.gov.au/medals/>.

Apart from the nominations for Australia Day and Queen's Birthday awards, presentations are made by the relevant Star Ranked or Senior Executive Service Officers.

To provide the level of detail requested would require an unreasonable diversion of departmental resources.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Change Management

Question reference number: 135

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (1) Has the Department/Agency engaged in a policy of Change Management? If yes:
 - (a) Please detail the policy.
 - (b) When was the policy introduced?
 - (c) What are the goals of the policy?
 - (d) How much was spent on consulting for the policy and who was contracted for this consultation?
 - (e) How much was spent implementing this policy?

Answer:

- (1) Yes.

- (a-c) The Defence Employees Collective Agreement 2012-14 sets out the framework for the management of employees who are affected by organisational change. Organisational change is an ongoing feature of Defence business improvement activities.

The framework has its origins in legislative instruments such as the *Public Service Act 1999*. It has been a requirement since at least 1999 that all Enterprise Agreements include provisions for compulsory redeployment or retrenchment.

The framework includes a range of measures to support employees who may be without an ongoing role to transition to other work, gain new skills to support transition or, where no suitable work is available, retrenchment.

- (d) Nil.

- (e) Nil. The implementation of the framework was undertaken as part of the broader implementation of the DECA (2012-2014).

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Code of Conduct – Department

Question reference number: 136

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) Please provide a copy of the departmental staff code of conduct.
- (b) Have there been any identified breaches of this code of conduct by departmental staff?
 - (i) If yes, list the breaches identified, broken by staffing classification level.
 - (ii) If yes, what remedy was put in place to manage the breach? If no remedy has been put in place, why not?
 - (iii) If yes, when was the breach identified? By whom? When was the Minister made aware?
 - (iv) If yes, were there any legal ramifications for the department or staff member? Please detail.

Answer:

- (a) Defence uses the Australian Public Service (APS) Code of Conduct under the *Public Service Act 1999* Section 13 (see Attachment A).
- (b) Yes.
 - (i) to (iv) Refer to Attachment B. The Minister was not advised of APS Code of Conduct breaches as there is no requirement to do so. To date there are no legal ramifications for the department or staff members for breaches of the APS Code of Conduct determined since 14 September 2015.

Elements of the APS Code of Conduct

S13 (1) An APS employee must behave honestly and with integrity in connection with APS employment.

S13 (2) An APS employee must act with care and diligence in connection with APS employment.

S13 (3) An APS employee, when acting in connection with APS employment, must treat everyone with respect and courtesy, and without harassment.

S13 (4) An APS employee, when acting in connection with APS employment, must comply with all applicable Australian laws. For this purpose, Australian law means:

- a) any Act (including this Act), or any instrument made under an Act, or
- b) any law of a State or Territory, including any instrument made under such a law.

S13 (5) An APS employee must comply with any lawful and reasonable direction given by someone in the employee's Agency who has authority to give the direction.

S13 (6) An APS employee must maintain appropriate confidentiality about dealings that the employee has with any Minister or Minister's member of staff.

S13 (7) An APS employee must disclose, and take reasonable steps to avoid, any conflict of interest (real or apparent) in connection with APS employment.

S13 (8) An APS employee must use Commonwealth resources in a proper manner.

S13 (9) An APS employee must not provide false or misleading information in response to a request for information that is made for official purposes in connection with the employee's APS employment.

S13 (10) An APS employee must not make improper use of:

- a) inside information. Or
- b) the employee's duties, status, power or authority; in order to gain, or seek to gain, a benefit or advantage for the employee or for any other person.

S13 (11) An APS employee must at all times behave in a way that upholds:

- a) the APS Values and APS Employment Principles; and
- b) the integrity and good reputation of the employee's Agency and the APS.

S13 (12) An APS employee on duty overseas must at all times behave in a way that upholds the good reputation of Australia.

S13 (13) An APS employee must comply with any other conduct requirement that is prescribed by the regulations.

Attachment B

Defence APS breaches of the Code of Conduct 14 September 2015 – 25 February 2016

Classification	Total Employees	Elements of the APS Code of Conduct Breached*	Outcome/Sanctions(s) Applied If Yes	If No	Breach identified	Found by Whom
SES	0					
EL2	1	S13(1), S13(5), S13(8), S13(11)	Reprimand and reduction in salary		27 Nov 2015	Conduct & Sanction Delegate
EL1	4	S13(1), S13(5), S13(11)	Reprimand		03 Nov 2015	Conduct & Sanction Delegate
		S13(5), S13(8), S13(11)		Resigned	15 Dec 2015	Conduct Delegate
		S13(1), S13(5), S13(11)	Reduction in Classification		27 Jan 2016	Conduct & Sanction Delegate
		S13(3), S13(5)	Reprimand		27 Jan 2016	Conduct & Sanction Delegate
APS6	0					
APS5	0					
APS4	1	S13(3),		Resigned	22 Dec 2015	Conduct Delegate Merit Protection Commission (external)
APS3	1	S13(1), S13(9), S13(11)	Termination of Employment		18 Jan 2016	Conduct & Sanction Delegate
APS2	1	S13(3), S13(5), S13(11)	Fine		15 Feb 2016	Conduct & Sanction Delegate
APS1	0					

*** Please refer to Attachment A for descriptors of the Elements of the APS Code of Conduct.**

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates– 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Fee for Services

Question reference number: 137

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) Have any existing services provided by the department / agency moved from being free to a user-pay service? Have any additional fees been placed on existing services? If yes please provide a list and include:
- (b) Name of the fee and a short description of what it covers.
- (c) How much is the fee (and is it a flat fee or a percentage of the service).
- (d) The date the fee came into place.
- (e) Were any reviews requested, commenced or complemented into the benefits and drawbacks of attaching the fee to the service? If yes, please detail and provide a copy of the review.
- (f) What consultation was carried out before the fee was put into place?
- (g) How was the fee put into place (e.g. through legislation, regulation changes etc)?
- (h) What justification is there for the fee?

Answer:

(a) to (h) Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September 2015 no services within the Defence Portfolio have moved from being free to a user-pay service and no additional fees have been placed on existing services.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Documents provided to the Minister

Question reference number: 138

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (a) Excluding policy or correspondence briefs, how many documents are provided to the Minister's office on a regular and scheduled basis? Including documents that are not briefs to the minister and do not require ministerial signature.
- (b) List those documents, their schedule and their purpose (broken down by ministerial signature and office for noting documents)
- (c) How are they transmitted to the office?
- (d) What mode of delivery is used (hardcopy, email) for those documents?
- (e) What level officer are they provided to in the minister's office?

Answer:

(a) to (e) Please refer Question on Notice No. 136 from Supplementary Budget Estimates Hearing of 22 October 2014. This response remains extant.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Merchandise or Promotional Material

Question reference number: 139

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) Has the department purchased any merchandise or promotional material?
- (b) List by item, and purpose for each item, including if the material is for a specific policy or program or for a generic purpose (note that purpose)
- (c) List the cost for each item
- (d) List the quantity of each item
- (e) Who suggested these material be created?
- (f) Who approved its creation?
- (g) Provide copies of authorisation
- (h) When was the Minister informed of the material being created?
- (i) Who created the material?
- (j) How was that person selected?
- (k) How many individuals or groups were considered in selecting who to create the material?

Answer:

(a) Yes, the total departmental spend on merchandise or promotional material for the period 14 September 2015 to 01 January 2016 is \$534,778 (GST exclusive).

(b) to (k) The material purchased is generic ADF promotional material which includes but is not limited to pins, booklets, brochures, water bottles, medallions, pens, lanyards, promotional banners, magnets, umbrellas, flags, polo shirts, jumpers, promotional coins, and cuff links. Given the breadth of the question it is not possible to provide a more specific response without an unreasonable diversion of resources.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Domain Usage

Question reference number: 140

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

Please provide a breakdown of the domain usage for the 50 most utilised (by data sent and received), unique (internet) domains accessed by the minister's office. Please provide:

- (a) Domain name of the website being accessed (or IP address if the Domain is unavailable in the tracking system).
- (b) Amount of data downloaded and uploaded to the site.
- (c) Number of times the site was accessed.

Answer:

- (a) to (c) Due to the breadth and complexity of the question, an unreasonable diversion of departmental resources from higher priority tasks would be required to develop a response.

Sentate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Ministerial Website

Question reference number: 141

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) How much has been spent on the Minister's website? List each item of expenditure and cost.
- (b) Who is responsible for uploading information to the Minister's website?
 - (i) Have any departmental staff been required to work outside regular hours to maintain the Minister's website? Please detail.

Answer:

- (a) Defence pays an annual fee to the Department of Finance to use its Govspace platform to host the Minister's website. The fee for 2015-16 was \$9,000 (excl GST).
- (b) Please refer to Refer to Question on Notice 117, parts (b) and (b)(i) from Additional Estimates Hearing of 26 February 2014. This response remains extant.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Report Printing

Question reference number: 142

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

Have any reports, budget papers, statements, white papers or report-like documents printed for or by the department been pulped, put in storage, shredded or disposed of? If so please give details; name of report, number of copies, cost of printing, who order the disposal, reason for disposal.

Answer:

Please refer to Question on Notice No. 122 from Budget Estimates Hearing of 2 and 3 June 2014. This response remains extant.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Freedom of Information Requests – Quantity

Question reference number: 143

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (1) How many requests for documents under the FOI Act have been received?
- (2) Of these, how many documents have been determined to be deliberative documents?
- (3) Of those assessed as deliberative documents:
 - (a) For how many has access to the document been refused on the basis that it would be contrary to the public interest?
 - (b) For how many has a redacted document been provided?

Answer:

- (1) 182.
- (2) Two
- (3) (a) Two
(b) None

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Ministerial Motor Vehicle

Question reference number: 144

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question: Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

Has the minister been provided with or had access to a motor vehicle? If so:

- a) What is the make and model?
- b) How much did it cost?
- c) When was it provided?
- d) Was the entire cost met by the department? If not, how was the cost met?
- e) What, if any, have been the ongoing costs associated with this motor vehicle? Please include costs such as maintenance and fuel.
- f) Are these costs met by the department? If not, how are these costs met?
- g) Please provide a copy of the guidelines that determine if a minister is entitled to a motor vehicle.
- h) Have these guidelines changed during the specified period of time? If so, please detail.
- i) Please provide a copy of the guidelines that determine how a minister is to use a motor vehicle they have been provided with. Please include details such as whether the motor vehicle can be used for personal uses.
- j) Have these guidelines changed during the specified period of time? If so, please detail.

Answer:

(a) and (c) The Department of Defence provides a Ford Territory SZ 2.7 TDCi TS SSS AWD to the Minister for Defence. The lease and related costs were transferred from the Department of Finance to the Department of Defence with effect 18 September 2013.

(b), (d), (e) and (f) The cost of the vehicle from 14 September 2015, including maintenance and fuel, has been met fully by the department and totals \$5,485.98.

(g), (h), (i) and (j) These questions have been previously answered under Question on Notice No. 98 from Supplementary Budget Estimates of 22 October 2014. This response remains extant.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Ministerial Staff – Motor Vehicles – non MoPS

Question reference number: 145

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question: Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

Outside of MoPS Act entitlements, have any of the Minister's staff been provided with a motor vehicle? If so:

- a) What is the make and model?
- b) How much did it cost?
- c) When was it provided?
- d) Was the entire cost met by the department? If not, how was the cost met?
- e) What, if any, have been the ongoing costs associated with this motor vehicle? Please include costs such as maintenance and fuel.
- f) Are these costs met by the department? If not, how are these costs met?
- g) Please provide a copy of the guidelines that determine this entitlement to a motor vehicle.
- h) Have these guidelines changed during the specified period? If so, please detail.
- i) Please provide a copy of the guidelines that determine how a motor vehicle is to be used that they have been provided with. Please include details such as whether the motor vehicle can be used for personal uses.
- j) Have these guidelines changed during the specified period? If so, please detail.

Answer:

(a) to (j) These questions were previously answered under Question on Notice No. 125 from Budget Estimates of 2 and 3 June 2014 and Question on Notice No. 99 from Supplementary Budget Estimates of 22 October 2014. This response remains extant.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Lobbyist Register Meetings

Question reference number: 146

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) List all interactions between the department/agency with any representative listed on the lobbyist register
- (b) List the participants in the meeting, the topic of the discussion, who arranged or requested the meeting, the location of the meeting
- (c) List all interactions between the Minister/parliamentary Secretary and/or their offices with any representative listed on the lobbyist register during the specified period. List the participants in the meeting, the topic of the discussion, who arranged or requested the meeting, the location of the meeting.

Answer:

(a)-(c) Please refer to Question on Notice No. 103 from Budget Estimates Hearing of 2 and 3 June 2014. This response remains extant.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Workplace Assessments

Question reference number: 147

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) How much has been spent on workplace ergonomic assessments?
 - (i) List each item of expenditure and cost
- (b) Have any assessments, not related to an existing disability, resulted in changes to workplace equipment or set up?
- (c) If so, list each item of expenditure and cost related to those changes

Answer:

- (a) Defence's financial management systems indicate \$16,213.37 was spent on workplace assessments for the period 14 September 2015 to 31 January 2016. To provide more specific details would be an unreasonable diversion of departmental resources.
- (b) Defence employees are not obligated to declare an existing disability, under the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992*, therefore Defence is unable to separate costs of workplace ergonomic assessments that relate to a disability or workplace requirement.
- (c) Nil.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates - 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Freedom of Information – Overall Statistics

Question reference number: 148

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question: Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September 2015:

- (1) How many FOI requests were received to date?
- (2) How many of those requests were finalised within the regular timeframes provided under the FOI Act?
- (3) How many of those requests were granted an extension of time under s 15AA of the FOI Act?
- (4) How many of those requests were granted an extension of time under s 15AB of the FOI Act?
- (5) How many of those requests were finalised out of time?

Answer:

- (1) 182
- (2) All
- (3) Five
- (4) One
- (5) Nil

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Multiple Tenders

Question reference number: 149

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015: List any tenders that were re-issued or issued multiple times:

- (1) Why were they re-issued or issued multiple times?
- (2) Were any applicants received for the tenders before they were re-issued or repeatedly issued?
- (3) Were those applicants asked to resubmit their tender proposal?

Answer:

(1)-(3) There have been twelve requests for tender re-issued by Defence between 14 September 2015 and 1 March 2016. Details requested are in the table below:

List any tenders that were re-issued or issued multiple times	(1). Why were they re-issued or issued multiple times?	(2). Were any applicants received for the tenders before they were re-issued or repeatedly issued?	(3). Were those applicants asked to resubmit their tender proposal?
Regional South Australia Fencing Works – Repair and Replacement of Boundary Fencing at Regional Defence Sites. Tender ID: C 10086	Nil responses received	No	Not applicable
Structural & Civil Works at Albany Training Depot Tender ID: CW 15000804	Nil responses received	No	Not applicable
RAAF Base Curtin - Replace Demountables	One response was received which was non-compliant	One response	No

List any tenders that were re-issued or issued multiple times	(1). Why were they re-issued or issued multiple times?	(2). Were any applicants received for the tenders before they were re-issued or repeatedly issued?	(3). Were those applicants asked to resubmit their tender proposal?
Tender ID: CW 15001102			
Ember Protection Works to Buildings at HMAS Stirling Tender ID: CW 15001902	One response was received which was deemed not value for money	Yes	No
Gallipoli/Swartz Barracks Building and Fire Systems Refurbishment – Enoggera/Oakey Tender ID: QD 10148	Nil responses received. Work repackaged into two packages for reissue	No	Not applicable
Urban North Roofing Works Tender ID: QD 10229	Nil responses received. Work repackaged into two packages for reissue	No	Not applicable
RAAF Scherger Replacement of Mechanical Lock Tender ID: QD 15000703	Nil responses received	No	Not applicable
SE QLD Bird Proofing Tender: QD 15001600	Nil compliant responses received	Yes	Yes
Airbase Operations Communication Systems NT, QLD and NSW Tender ID: SF 15001234	One response received which was deemed not value for money	Yes	No
Boilers and Coolers Upgrade and Replacement, Kapooka Military Area Tender ID: SN 15000400	Two responses were received which were deemed not value for money	Yes	No
Fire Systems Compliance Works at Campbell and Palmer Barracks Tender ID: CW 10472	Two responses were received which were non-compliant	Yes	No
Personal Abandonment Lifejacket and Suits Tender ID: CASG/MSD/RFT0833/15	Nil compliant responses received from invited Tenderers which were Pre-qualified under an earlier process Tender ID: DMOMSD/RFP0058/2015	Yes	Yes

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Market Research

Question reference number: 150

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2015

Question: Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

List any market research conducted by the department/agency:

- (a) List the total cost of this research
- (b) List each item of expenditure and cost, broken down by division and program
- (c) Who conducted the research?
- (d) How were they identified?
- (e) Where was the research conducted?
- (f) In what way was the research conducted?
- (g) Were focus groups, round tables or other forms of research tools used?
- (h) How were participants for these focus groups et al selected?
- (i) How was the firm or individual that conducted the review selected?
- (j) What input did the Minister have?
- (k) How was it approved?
- (l) Were other firms or individuals considered? If yes, please detail.

Answer:

(a) to (l) Information on Defence's market research expenditure will be included in the *Defence Annual Report 2015-16*.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates - 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Departmental Upgrades

Question reference number: 151

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

Has the department/agency engaged in any new refurbishments, upgrades or changes to their building or facilities?

- (a) If so, list these
- (b) If so, list the total cost for these changes
- (c) If so, list the itemised cost for each item of expenditure
- (d) If so, who conducted the works?
- (e) If so, list the process for identifying who would conduct these works
- (f) If so, when are the works expected to be completed?

Answer:

- (a) (b) (c) (d) and (f) The Department of Defence is concurrently engaged in the maintenance, refurbishment and construction of many facilities. The Estate Upkeep Program (EUP) engages in up to 80,000 separate tasks each month. The budget of the Estate Upkeep Program is \$353 million per annum.

Defence also manages an Estate Works Program (EWP) that consists of approximately 800 projects per annum with a cost of approximately \$400 million per annum.

The Major Capital Facilities Program (MCFP) consists of approximately 110 projects in the approved delivery phase. The average expenditure over the last five years is approximately \$1.1 billion per annum.

It would be an unreasonable diversion of departmental resources to itemise the detail across the three Programs (EUP, EWP and MCFP) in the manner requested.

- (e) In accordance with the Commonwealth Procurement Rules, each MCFP or EWP project is advertised on AusTender. The tenders subsequently received are

evaluated by a Tender Evaluation Board to determine the most suitable company to conduct the works. Works delivered under the EUP are the responsibility of the Estate Maintenance and Operation Services contractors, which were engaged through an open tender process in 2014.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Wine Coolers, Fridges and Eskies for Alcoholic Beverages

Question reference number: 152

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

Has the department/agency purchased or leased any new wine coolers, or wine fridges or other devices for the purpose of housing alcohol beverages, including Eskies?

- (a) If so, list these
- (b) If so, list the total cost for these items
- (c) If so, list the itemised cost for each item of expenditure
- (d) If so, where were these purchased?
- (e) If so, list the process for identifying how they would be purchased
- (f) If so, what is the current location for these items?
- (g) If so, what is the current stocking level for each of these items?

Answer:

(a) to (g) Defence conducts all procurement in accordance with Defence's Accountable Authority Instructions (AAIs), Financial Delegation Manual (FINMAN 2), the *Commonwealth Procurement Rules* and the Financial Management Manual (FINMAN 5), while having regard to the Defence Procurement Policy Manual.

The items in question are not identified as discrete items on Defence's financial system so the information sought would have to be collated manually. To provide the details requested would be an unreasonable diversion of Departmental resources.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Office Plants

Question reference number: 153

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

Has the department/agency purchased or leased any office plants?

- (a) If so, list these
- (b) If so, list the total cost for these items
- (c) If so, list the itemised cost for each item of expenditure
- (d) If so, where were these purchased
- (e) If so, list the process for identifying how they would be purchased
- (f) If so, what is the current location for these items?

Answer:

Defence conducts all procurement in accordance with Defence's Accountable Authority Instructions (AAIs), Financial Delegation Manual (FINMAN 2), the *Commonwealth Procurement Rules* and the Financial Management Manual (FINMAN 5), while having regard to the Defence Procurement Policy Manual.

Defence does lease office plants but they are not identified as a discrete item on Defence's financial system. The information sought would have to be collated manually and this would be an unreasonable diversion of Departmental resources.

Senate Standing Committee of Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Office Recreation Facilities

Question reference number: 154

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

Has the department/agency purchased or leased or constructed any office recreation facilities, activities or games (including but not limited to pool tables, table tennis tables or others)?

- (a) If so, list these
- (b) If so, list the total cost for these items
- (c) If so, list the itemised cost for each item of expenditure
- (d) If so, where were these purchased
- (e) If so, list the process for identifying how they would be purchased
- (f) If so, what is the current location for these items?
- (g) If so, what is the current usage for each of these items?

Answer:

(a) to (g) Defence conducts procurement in accordance with Defence's Accountable Authority Instructions (AAIs), Financial Delegations Manual (FINMAN 2), and the *Commonwealth Procurement Rules*.

The items in question are not identified as discrete items on Defence's financial system so the information sought would have to be collated manually. To provide the details requested would be an unreasonable diversion of Departmental resources.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates - 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Building Lease Costs

Question reference number: 155

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (1) What has been the total cost of building leases for the agency / department?
- (2) Please provide a detailed list of each building that is currently leased. Please detail by:
 - (a) Date the lease agreement is active from.
 - (b) Date the lease agreement ends.
 - (c) Is the lease expected to be renewed? If not, why not?
 - (d) Location of the building (City and state).
 - (e) Cost of the lease.
 - (f) Why the building is necessary for the operations of the agency / department.
- (3) Please provide a detailed list of each building that had a lease that was not renewed during the specified period. Please detail by:
 - (a) Date from which the lease agreement was active.
 - (b) Date the lease agreement ended.
 - (c) Why was the lease not renewed?
 - (d) Location of the building (City and state).
 - (e) Cost of the lease.
 - (f) Why the building was necessary for the operations of the agency / department.
- (4) Please provide a detailed list of each building that is expected to be leased in the next 12 months. Please detail by:
 - (a) Date the lease agreement is expected to become active.
 - (b) Date the lease agreement is expected to end.
 - (c) Expected location of the building (City and state).
 - (d) Expected cost of the lease. i.e. Has this cost been allocated into the budget?
 - (e) Why the building is necessary for the operations of the agency / department.

- (5) For each building owned or leased by the department:
- (a) What is the current occupancy rate for the building?
 - (b) If the rate is less than 100%, detail what the remaining being used for.

Answer:

- (1) The total cost of building leases for Defence from 14 September 2015 until 1 March 2016 was \$69.94 million (GST inclusive). This figure reflects the actual payments made on the first day of each month for the six months from September 2015 to March 2016 and includes a one-off \$25 million break lease fee for Moorebank, NSW.
- (2) (a) to (f) Defence has 56 building leases on 54 office accommodation sites (two leased buildings each have two leases for different parts of the buildings), four residential leases and 28 leases for other purposes including warehouse, training, and equipment, some of which include multiple buildings. The requested lease details are at Attachment A.
- (3) (a) to (f) The following leases were not renewed during the specified period:
- Canberra, ACT. The lease was terminated on 29 February 2016 due to consolidation into other existing leased space. The lease commenced on 1 March 2013. The annual cost of the lease was approximately \$410,774 (GST inclusive). The lease was required to meet an identified business requirement.
 - Moorebank, NSW. The lease was terminated 11 December 2015 due to relocation to Defence owned estate. The lease commenced on 26 March 2013. The annual cost of the lease was approximately \$21.98 million (GST inclusive). Defence negotiated a break lease amount of \$25 million, representing a saving of approximately \$33 million to exit the lease early. The lease was required to meet an identified business requirement.
 - Winellie, NT. Lease was terminated on 12 December 2015 due to personnel relocation to Defence owned estate. The lease commenced on 13 December 2014. The annual cost of the lease was approximately \$440,000 (GST inclusive). The lease was required to meet an identified business requirement.
- (4) (a) to (e) None.
- (5) The requested details are provided at Attachment B. Defence has based its office accommodation occupancy data on the September 2015 Australian Government Property Data Collection report. The data is collected for building office accommodation which is greater than 500m². Occupancy data is not provided for building office accommodation that is less than 500m², or for military and intelligence sites, or otherwise exempt from reporting. An occupancy rate is not applicable to leases other than office accommodation and residential purposes.

Region	No.	a). Date the lease agreement is active from	b). Date the lease agreement ends	c). Is the lease agreement expected to be renewed? If not, why not?	d). Location of the building (City and state)	e). Cost of the lease (from 14 Sept 2015 to 1 Mar 2016)	f). Why the building is necessary for the operations of the agency/department
--------	-----	---	-----------------------------------	---	---	---	---

Commercial Office Buildings

ACT	1	01-Feb-2010	31-Jan-2022	Yes	Canberra Airport, ACT	\$2,837,270.15	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	2	01-Aug-2013	31-Jul-2020	Yes	Fyshwick, ACT	\$181,145.03	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	3	19-Dec-2011	18-Dec-2016	Yes	Canberra Airport, ACT	\$175,294.08	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	4	18-Dec-2012	30-Apr-2016	Yes	Fyshwick, ACT	\$134,268.31	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	5	01-Mar-2015	28-Feb-2018	Yes	Fyshwick, ACT	\$36,595.68	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	6	08-May-2010	07-May-2017	Yes	Mitchell, ACT	\$706,002.55	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	7	01-Oct-2011	30-Sep-2016	Yes	Fyshwick, ACT	\$471,756.78	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	8	01-Apr-2013	31-Mar-2020	Yes	Fyshwick, ACT	\$163,419.03	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	9	01-Apr-2013	31-May-2020	Yes	Fyshwick, ACT	\$75,354.35	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	10	01-Mar-2014	29-Feb-2016	Yes	Deakin, ACT	\$1,557,322.97	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	11	01-Dec-2011	30-Nov-2016	Yes	Canberra, ACT	\$155,958.99	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	12	01-Nov-2011	31-Oct-2017	Yes	Canberra Airport, ACT	\$412,616.99	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	13	01-May-2015	30-Apr-2017	Yes	Canberra Airport, ACT	\$224,891.54	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	14	01-Mar-2007	28-Feb-2017	Yes	Canberra Airport, ACT	\$1,891,936.75	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	15	01-Feb-2010	31-Jan-2022	Yes	Canberra Airport, ACT	\$1,715,300.24	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	16	01-Jul-2013	30-Jun-2023	Yes	Canberra Airport, ACT	\$1,857,555.59	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	17	22-Jun-2012	21-Jun-2017	Yes	Canberra Airport, ACT	\$1,026,256.28	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	18	01-Dec-2005	30-Apr-2016	Yes	Mitchell, ACT	\$130,897.80	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	19	21-Dec-2006	20-Dec-2016	Yes	Canberra Airport, ACT	\$1,792,505.39	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	20	22-Jun-2012	21-Jun-2017	Yes	Canberra Airport, ACT	\$956,871.74	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	21	14-Jun-2012	13-Jun-2022	Yes	Canberra Airport, ACT	\$1,543,875.41	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	22	14-Jun-2012	13-Jun-2022	Yes	Canberra Airport, ACT	\$1,056,634.43	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	23	04-Jun-2007	03-Jun-2017	Yes	Canberra Airport, ACT	\$1,856,435.30	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	24	01-Nov-2014	31-Oct-2016	Yes	Queanbeyan	\$116,641.64	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	25	04-Jun-2007	03-Jun-2017	Yes	Canberra Airport, ACT	\$1,872,001.07	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	26	01-Jul-2013	30-Jun-2023	Yes	Canberra Airport, ACT	\$322,170.75	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	27	01-Oct-2015	30-Sep-2017	Yes	Fyshwick, ACT	\$139,893.66	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	28	17-Mar-2014	16-Oct-2019	Yes	Canberra, ACT	\$0.50	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	29	07-Aug-2014	06-Aug-2023	Yes	Reid, ACT	\$0.00	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	30	15-May-2012	14-May-2022	Yes	Deakin, ACT	\$345,383.12	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	31	01-Jun-2013	31-May-2020	Yes	Fyshwick, ACT	\$247,756.52	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	32	15-Jun-2002	14-Jun-2022	Yes	Campbell, ACT	\$6,149,415.03	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	33	12-Oct-2010	11-Oct-2025	Yes	Reid, ACT	\$3,029,458.80	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	34	13-Jun-2003	12-Jun-2023	Yes	Weston, ACT	\$1,824,076.76	Identified Business Requirement
CW	35	01-Sep-2014	31-Aug-2016	Yes	Darwin, NT	\$10,978.22	Identified Business Requirement
CW	36	01-Jul-2013	30-Jun-2018	Yes	Dudley Park, SA	\$594,866.25	Identified Business Requirement
CW	37	10-Apr-2015	09-Apr-2016	Yes	Darwin, NT	\$111,785.58	Identified Business Requirement
CW	38	01-Jan-2012	31-Dec-2016	Yes	Rockingham, WA	\$698,157.57	Identified Business Requirement
CW	39	01-Dec-2014	30-Nov-2019	Yes	Winnellie, NT	\$125,840.00	Identified Business Requirement
CW	40	01-Jan-2016	31-Dec-2020	Yes	Rockingham, WA	\$91,684.12	Identified Business Requirement
CW	41	01-Jan-2014	31-Dec-2018	Yes	Joondalup, WA	\$69,201.72	Identified Business Requirement
NNSW	42	02-May-2008	01-May-2023	No. It is anticipated the personnel can be relocated back into owned Defence facilities at expiration of the lease.	Raymond Terrace, NSW	\$542,685.00	Identified Business Requirement
NNSW	43	01-Apr-2010	31-Mar-2020	No. It is anticipated the personnel can be relocated back into owned Defence facilities at expiration of the lease.	Penrith, NSW	\$699,437.97	Identified Business Requirement
QLD	44	01-Jul-2011	30-Jun-2016	Yes	Brisbane, QLD	\$420,523.58	Identified Business Requirement

Region	No.	a). Date the lease agreement is active from	b). Date the lease agreement ends	c). Is the lease agreement expected to be renewed? If not, why not?	d). Location of the building (City and state)	e). Cost of the lease (from 14 Sept 2015 to 1 Mar 2016)	f). Why the building is necessary for the operations of the agency/department
QLD	45	01-Dec-2015	30-Jun-2017	Yes	Brisbane, QLD	\$101,633.57	Identified Business Requirement
QLD	46	01-Sep-2010	29-Feb-2016	No. Personnel are being relocated to a more suitable facility.	Cairns, QLD	\$50,310.65	Identified Business Requirement
QLD	47	07-Sep-2015	06-Sep-2020		Cairns, QLD	\$48,229.39	Identified Business Requirement
QLD	48	01-Dec-2014	30-Nov-2019	Yes	Mitchelton, QLD	\$88,124.91	Identified Business Requirement
QLD	49	01-Feb-2012	31-Jan-2017	Yes	Pullenvale, QLD	\$149,292.28	Identified Business Requirement
QLD	50	01-Jan-2013	31-Jan-2017	Yes	Pullenvale, QLD	\$11,549.84	Identified Business Requirement
QLD	51	01-May-2013	30-Apr-2018	Yes	Townsville, QLD	\$70,249.36	Identified Business Requirement
SNSW	52	17-May-2011	16-May-2021	Yes	Sydney, NSW	\$7,006,765.10	Identified Business Requirement
SNSW	53	28-Oct-2011	27-Oct-2016	Yes	Nowra, NSW	\$100,025.20	Identified Business Requirement
SNSW	54	01-Aug-2013	31-Jul-2018	Yes	Wagga Wagga, NSW	\$37,174.06	Identified Business Requirement
SSNW	55	01-Sep-2010	30-Apr-2016	Yes	Cooma, NSW	\$94,504.96	Identified Business Requirement
SSNW	56	22-Jun-2011	21-Jun-2016	Yes	Wollongong, NSW	\$843,718.37	Identified Business Requirement
VIC/TAS	57	16-Jun-2011	15-Jun-2021	Yes	Melbourne, VIC	\$5,256,866.07	Identified Business Requirement
VIC/TAS	58	01-Jul-2013	30-Jun-2016	Yes	Laverton North, VIC	\$244,426.11	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	59	01-Jul-2012	07-Jun-2015	No - lease terminated	Barton, ACT	\$0.00	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	60	01-Mar-2013	29-Feb-2016	No - lease terminated	Turner, ACT	\$190,310.40	Identified Business Requirement
Total lease cost - Commercial Office Buildings						\$52,665,303.38	

Residential

NNSW	1	15-May-2015	14-May-2018	Yes	Homebush, NSW	\$2,340,305.72	Identified Business Requirement
NNSW	2	15-May-2015	14-May-2018	Yes	Homebush, NSW	\$833,200.23	Identified Business Requirement
NNSW	3	15-May-2015	14-May-2018	Yes	North Strathfield, NSW	\$1,939,133.46	Identified Business Requirement
CW	4	15-Dec-2014	14-Dec-2016	Yes	Christmas Island, WA	\$32,576.06	Identified Business Requirement
Total lease cost - Residential Buildings						\$5,145,215.46	

Buildings (Non Commercial Office)

ACT	1	01-May-2004	30-Apr-2019	Yes	Canberra Airport, ACT	\$5,255,006.19	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	2	01-Jul-2013	31-Mar-2016	Yes	Fyshwick, ACT	\$69,217.89	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	3	01-Jun-2013	31-May-2016	Yes	Hume, ACT	\$104,907.00	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	4	01-Oct-2014	30-Sep-2019	Yes	Mitchell, ACT	\$56,844.81	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	5	15-May-2012	20-Aug-2016	Yes	Queanbeyan, NSW	\$0.00	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	6	05-Apr-2012	04-Apr-2017	Yes	Queanbeyan, NSW	\$390,890.50	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	7	01-Sep-2014	31-Aug-2019	Yes	Symonston, ACT	\$172,198.13	Identified Business Requirement
ACT	8	01-Mar-2015	28-Feb-2018	Yes	Fyshwick, ACT	\$109,397.31	Identified Business Requirement
CW	9	01-Jul-2013	30-Jun-2018	Yes	Henderson, WA	\$0.00	Identified Business Requirement
CW	10	01-Nov-2015	31-Oct-2025	Yes	Cannington, WA	\$27,769.50	Identified Business Requirement
CW	11	01-May-2014	30-Apr-2019	Yes	Cocos Island, WA	\$0.00	Identified Business Requirement
CW	12	01-Jul-2013	30-Jun-2018	Yes	Rockingham, WA	\$28,512.99	Identified Business Requirement
CW	13	01-Dec-2012	30-Nov-2017	Yes	Rockingham, WA	\$53,081.71	Identified Business Requirement
NNSW	14	01-Jul-2014	30-Jun-2017	Yes	Alexandria, NSW	\$212,035.89	Identified Business Requirement
NNSW	15	16-Sep-2014	15-Sep-2024	Yes	Darlington, NSW	\$0.00	Identified Business Requirement
NNSW	16	01-Jan-1956	31-Dec-2055	Yes	Kensington, NSW	\$0.00	Identified Business Requirement
NNSW	17	01-Oct-2015	30-Sep-2020	Yes	Ultimo, NSW	\$3,738,778.89	Identified Business Requirement
NNSW	18	01-Apr-2015	31-Mar-2020	Yes	Port Macquarie, NSW	\$31,890.38	Identified Business Requirement
NNSW	19	01-Jul-2015	30-Jun-2020	Yes	Port Macquarie, NSW	\$10,550.93	Identified Business Requirement
NNSW	20	01-Apr-2008	31-Mar-2018	Yes	Eveleigh, NSW	\$1,502,020.91	Identified Business Requirement
QLD	21	07-Sep-2015	06-Sep-2020	Yes	Cairns, QLD	\$48,229.39	Identified Business Requirement
QLD	22	01-Apr-1999	31-Mar-2019	Yes	Cloncurry, QLD	\$0.00	Identified Business Requirement
QLD	23	01-May-2013	30-Apr-2018	Yes	South Townsville, QLD	\$29,801.26	Identified Business Requirement
QLD	24	23-Nov-2013	22-Nov-2020	Yes	Rockhampton, QLD	\$159,069.79	Identified Business Requirement
SNSW	25	10-May-2014	09-May-2019	Yes	Cowra, NSW	\$14,301.27	Identified Business Requirement

Region	No.	a). Date the lease agreement is active from	b). Date the lease agreement ends	c). Is the lease agreement expected to be renewed? If not, why not?	d). Location of the building (City and state)	e). Cost of the lease (from 14 Sept 2015 to 1 Mar 2016)	f). Why the building is necessary for the operations of the agency/department
VIC/TAS	26	10-Feb-2013	09-Feb-2018	Yes	Dandenong, VIC	\$141,853.47	Identified Business Requirement
VIC/TAS	27	01-Dec-2014	30-Nov-2017	Yes	Bridgewater, TAS	\$25,473.42	Identified Business Requirement
NNSW	28	26-Mar-2013	25-Mar-2018	No - lease terminated	Moorebank, NSW	\$30,495,050.01	
CW	29	13-Dec-2014	12-Dec-2015	No - lease terminated	Winnellie, NT	\$110,000.00	Identified Business Requirement
Total lease costs - Buildings (Non Commercial Offices)						\$12,181,831.59	

Total lease costs - all buildings 14 Sep 2015 to 1 Mar 2016 (incl. Moorebank break lease of \$25M) **\$69,992,350.42**

Total lease costs - all buildings 14 Sep 2015 to 1 Mar 2016 (less Moorebank break lease of \$25M) **\$44,992,350.42**

No	Name of Property	Location of the building (city, state)	Leased/Owned	Occupancy Rate (%)	If occupancy is identified as less than 100%, for what is the remaining used
Commercial Office Buildings					
1	Campbell Park	Campbell, ACT	Leased	73.7%	Vacant, allowance for churn
2	13 London Circuit	Canberra, ACT	Leased	75.0%	Vacant, allowance for churn
3	1 Molonglo Drive	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	77.6%	Vacant, allowance for churn
4	10 Richmond Avenue	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	54.5%	Vacant, allowance for churn
5	18 Brindabella Circuit	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	63.2%	Vacant, allowance for churn
6	20 Brindabella Circuit	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	95.2%	Vacant, allowance for churn
7	24 Scherger Drive F2	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	78.2%	Vacant, allowance for churn
8	25 Brindabella Circuit	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	76.9%	Fit-out works have been completed since this audit and another unit has moved in
9	26 Brindabella Circuit BP26	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	84.1%	Vacant, allowance for churn
10	26 Scherger Drive F3	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	75.8%	Vacant, allowance for churn
11	26 Richmond Avenue F1	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
12	28 Scherger Drive F4	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	74.8%	Vacant, allowance for churn
13	29 Brindabella Circuit BP29	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	83.0%	Vacant, allowance for churn
14	31 Brindabella Circuit BP31	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	88.0%	Vacant, allowance for churn
15	33 Brindabella Circuit BP33	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	80.3%	Vacant, allowance for churn
16	35 Brindabella Circuit BP35	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	79.1%	Vacant, allowance for churn
17	39 Brindabella Circuit BP39	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased	22.8%	Two floors had just been vacated as at this audit, they have since been backfilled
18	109 Kent Street	Deakin, ACT	Leased	70.3%	This site is being decanted as the lease is closing
19	8 Thesiger Court	Deakin, ACT	Leased	80.4%	Vacant, allowance for churn
20	1.2 Dairy Road	Fyshwick, ACT	Leased	50.0%	Half of this site is designated staging space
21	10 Whyalla Street	Fyshwick, ACT	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
22	104 Gladstone Street	Fyshwick, ACT	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
23	105 Tennant Street	Fyshwick, ACT	Leased	55.0%	Site is predominantly training rooms with office area attached
24	107 Tennant Street	Fyshwick, ACT	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
25	5 Tennant Street	Fyshwick, ACT	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
26	Building 5 101 Tennant Street	Fyshwick, ACT	Leased	65.4%	Site is predominantly training rooms with office area attached
27	101 Flemington Road	Mitchell, ACT	Leased	78.5%	Vacant, allowance for churn
28	Anzac Park West	Reid, ACT	Leased	87.9%	Vacant, allowance for churn
29	Building R1, Sir Thomas Blamey Square	Russell, ACT	Owned	85.8%	Vacant, allowance for churn
30	Building R2, Sir Thomas Blamey Square	Russell, ACT	Owned	73.6%	Vacant, allowance for churn
31	Building R3, Sir Thomas Blamey Square	Russell, ACT	Owned	86.1%	Vacant, allowance for churn
32	Building R8, Sir Thomas Blamey Square	Russell, ACT	Owned	62.6%	Defence is undertaking significant re-fitout works at this site
33	Level 4 Building R9 Russell Offices Russell Drive	Russell, ACT	Owned		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
34	Kirkpatrick Street	Weston, ACT	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
35	Hains Building, Princess Ave & Sharp Street	Cooma, NSW	Leased	79.9%	Vacant, allowance for churn
36	2 Barrow Street	Queanbeyan, NSW	Leased	50.0%	Site is predominantly archives with office area attached
37	Garden Street	Eveleigh, NSW	Leased	69.2%	Vacant, allowance for churn
38	Part Level 2, 55-57 Berry Street	Nowra, NSW	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
39	Level 1, 2 & 3, 311 High St	Penrith, NSW	Leased	66.9%	Vacant, allowance for churn
40	34 Lowe Street	Queanbeyan, NSW	Leased	63.6%	Vacant, allowance for churn
41	28-32 King Street	Raymond Terrace, NSW	Leased	85.1%	Vacant, allowance for churn
42	Defence Plaza, 270 Pitt Street	Sydney, NSW	Leased	74.6%	Vacant, allowance for churn
43	Suite 104 76 Morgan St	Wagga Wagga, NSW	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
44	Hydrographic Office, 8 Station St	Wollongong, NSW	Leased	93.5%	Vacant, allowance for churn
45	8 McMinn Street	Darwin, NT	Leased	97.2%	Vacant, allowance for churn
46	36 Mitchell Street	Darwin, NT	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
47	Lot 6633, 3 Tybell Street	Winnellie, NT	Leased	68.2%	Vacant, allowance for churn
48	151-171 Roma Street	Brisbane, QLD	Leased	85.6%	Vacant, allowance for churn
49	4/97 Spence St	Cairns, QLD	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
50	3 Jensen St	Cairns, QLD	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
51	71 Osborne Road	Mitchelton, QLD	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
52	Nathan Business Centre, 340 Ross River Road Aitkenvale	Townsville, QLD	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
53	DSTO Facility Moggil Road CSIRO	Pullenvale, QLD	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
54	6-14 Oxenham Street	Dudley Park, SA	Leased	84.2%	Vacant, allowance for churn

No	Name of Property	Location of the building (city, state)	Leased/Owned	Occupancy Rate (%)	If occupancy is identified as less than 100%, for what is the remaining used
55	Defence Plaza, 661 Bourke St	Melbourne, VIC	Leased	83.2%	Vacant, allowance for churn
56	Units 1-5, 105 Winton Road	Joondalup, WA	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
57	85 Chalgrove Avenue	Rockingham, WA	Leased	95.3%	Vacant, allowance for churn
58	Unit 3, 23-25 Chalgrove Avenue	Rockingham, WA	Leased		Exempt from the PRODAC data collection
Residential					
1	Paramatta Rd & Powell St	Homebush, NSW	Leased	100%	
2	Paramatta Rd & Powell St	Homebush, NSW	Leased	100%	
3	27-29 George St	North Strathfield, NSW	Leased	100%	
4	6 Abbots Nest	Christmas Island, WA	Leased	100%	
Buildings (Non Commercial Office)					
1	Canberra Airport SPA Facilities	Canberra Airport, ACT	Leased		Not Applicable
2	6-18 Mort St	Canberra, ACT	Leased		Not Applicable
3	50 Sheppard St	Hume, ACT	Leased		Not Applicable
5	44-46 Dacre St	Mitchell, ACT	Leased		Not Applicable
6	38 Townsville St	Fyshwick, ACT	Leased		Not Applicable
9	172/5 Bass St	Queanbeyan, NSW	Leased		Not Applicable
10	171/5 Bass St	Queanbeyan, NSW	Leased		Not Applicable
11	400 Harris St	Ultimo, NSW	Leased		Not Applicable
12	677 Day Ave	Kensington, NSW	Leased		Not Applicable
13	Unit 2, 923-935 Bourke Road	Alexandria, NSW	Leased		Not Applicable
14	Cnr Darlington & City Road	Darlington, NSW	Leased		Not Applicable
15	Munster St	Port Macquarie, NSW	Leased		Not Applicable
16	Munster St	Port Macquarie, NSW	Leased		Not Applicable
17	119 Fitzroy St	Cowra, NSW	Leased		Not Applicable
18	Cloncurry Aerodrome	Cloncurry, QLD	Leased		Not Applicable
19	Archer & Hubert St	South Townsville, QLD	Leased		Not Applicable
20	Rockhampton Airport	Rockhampton, QLD	Leased		Not Applicable
21	82 Cowle Rd	Bridgewater, TAS	Leased		Not Applicable
22	15 Fowler Rd	Dandenong, VIC	Leased		Not Applicable
23	Defence Prototype Eng Services Units 1 & 2 26 William Angliss Dr	Laverton North, VIC	Leased		Not Applicable
24	Unit 4, Lot 184	Cocos Island, WA	Leased		Not Applicable
25	10 Savery Way	Rockingham, WA	Leased		Not Applicable
26	Dixon Road MUD	Rockingham, WA	Leased		Not Applicable
27	20 Nautical Dr	Henderson, WA	Leased		Not Applicable
28	'Cyril Vickery Pavilion', Cnr Station St & Albany Hwy	Cannington, WA	Leased		Not Applicable

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Advertising and Marketing Services

Question reference number: 156

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Since the change of Prime Minister on 14 September, 2015:

- (a) How much has been spent by the department / agency on marketing?
 - (i) List the total cost
 - (ii) List each item of expenditure and cost
 - (iii) List the approving officer for each item.
 - (iv) Detail the ministerial or ministerial staff involvement in the commissioning process.
 - (v) Which firm provided the marketing?
- (b) How much has been spent by the department / agency on government advertising (including job ads)?
 - (i) List the total cost
 - (ii) List each item of expenditure and cost
 - (iii) Where the advertising appeared
 - (iv) List the approving officer for each item.
 - (v) Detail the ministerial or ministerial staff involvement in the commissioning process.
 - (vi) Detail the outlets that were paid for the advertising.
- (c) What government advertising is planned for the rest of the financial year?
 - (i) List the total expected cost.
 - (ii) List each item of expenditure and cost.
 - (iii) Where the advertising will appear
 - (iv) List the approving officer for each item.
 - (v) Detail the ministerial or ministerial staff involvement in the commissioning process.
 - (vi) Detail the outlets that have been or will be paid for the advertising.
- (d) Provide copies of approvals for advertising, including but not limited to, approvals made by the Prime Minister or his delegate, the Minister or their delegate, or the Department or their delegate.

Answer:

- (a) As reflected in Defence's financial management system the total amount spent by Defence on Marketing is nil between 14 September 2015 and 31 January 2016.
- (b) As reflected in Defence's financial management system the total amount spent by Defence on Advertising is \$23.73 million between 14 September 2015 and 31 January 2016. Of this \$23.39 million was for Australian Defence Force (ADF) Recruitment. The remaining \$0.34 million is spent on a variety of items such as recruitment of Australian Public Service (APS), Live Firing Notices, General event and Public notices. All items are purchased according to Defence's purchasing policies. These types of purchases are delegated to Defence officials and completed without the Minister being specifically informed.
- (c) Advertising for ADF recruitment has an expected value of \$64.09 million for FY 15/16. APS recruitment and other public notices will continue throughout the remainder of the year on an as needed basis.
- (d) To provide copies of approvals for advertising would be an unreasonable diversion of departmental resources.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Procedure Manual - Departmental

Question reference number: 157

Senator: Ludwig

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- a) Does the department have a procedure manual for communication between the department and the minister? If yes, please provide a copy and:
- b) When was the manual last updated?
- c) Who is responsible for updating the manual?
- d) Has the minister's office had any input into the content of the manual? If so, please detail.
- e) Who is the manual distributed to?
- f) Is anyone responsible for clearing communications before they are sent to the minister or the minister's office?

Answer:

(a) to (f) This question was asked previously at Senate Estimates [Supplementary Budget Estimates October 2014, Question on Notice No. 81]. This answer remains extant.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Mefloquine Use in the ADF

Question reference number: 158

Senator: McEwen

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator McEWEN: What dosage of mefloquine is prescribed to ADF members prior to and during deployment?

Air Vice Marshal Smart: They receive the standard dose of mefloquine. We do give a loading dose, from a Defence perspective. The reason is that we have a duty of care to protect our members from malaria, which is obviously a disease of great significance that can and does kill people on a regular basis. So we want to be sure that they have protection before they go away, as with all of our drugs. It also, of course, gives us an opportunity, under observation, to check whether they have any side-effects from the medication.

Senator McEWEN: When you say 'standard dose', is that the TGA approved dose?

Air Vice Marshal Smart: Yes.

Senator McEWEN: What is the additional loading dose, either percentage wise or milligram wise, or however you measure that?

Air Vice Marshal Smart: It is three different doses. I do not have that, so I will take that on notice.

Answer:

Mefloquine (LariamTM) comes as a 250mg tablet. The ADF dosage regimen is a loading dose of one tablet on each of seven, six and five days before deployment (total three tablets) and then one tablet per week during deployment and for two weeks after leaving the malarious area.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Stuart Robert – Departmental Awareness

Question reference number: 159

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: asked on 10 February 2016, Hansard page 19 and 20

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator CONROY: Who was acting for Mr Robert on each date of that leave approved?

Mr Richardson: I would need to take that on notice.

(.....)

Senator CONROY: In the case of this trip to China, was the department informed?

Mr Richardson: I would need to take on notice whether the department was informed. We were aware that the minister was in Beijing simply because he was designated to represent the Defence minister at a meeting in Singapore immediately after Beijing.

Senator CONROY: So the department/you were aware that he was in Beijing?

Mr Richardson: At some point, we became aware. I would need to let you know. But I think it was simply in the context of the arrangements.

Answer:

As stated on page 52 of the Additional Estimates 10 February 2016 Hansard, the then Minister for Defence, Senator Johnston, was acting for Assistant Minister Robert during the duration of his absence.

The first record that Defence has of becoming aware that the Assistant Minister would be in Beijing is dated 13 August 2014.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Budget Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Shipbuilding – Supply Ships Cost

Question reference number: 160

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: asked on Thursday, 17 March 2016, Hansard page 4

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

Senator CONROY: Am I also correct that Defence estimates the cost for the first two supply ships as \$1 billion to \$2 billion, with a further \$1 billion to \$2 billion for the third vessel?

Mr Richardson: I would need to refer that too.

Mr Nicholl: I would have to take that on notice, Senator

Answer:

The Integrated Investment Program (IIP) 2016 indicates that the approximate investment value for the first two supply ships will be \$1 billion - \$2 billion. A third replenishment ship, or additional support ship, will be considered in the late 2020s, against which the IIP has assigned an approximate investment value of \$1 billion - \$2 billion.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Shipbuilding – Preferred Tenderer

Question reference number: 161

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: asked on Thursday, 17 March 2016, Hansard page 4

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

Senator CONROY: On what date did the government make its decision to select Navantia as the preferred tenderer, and on what date were Navantia and Daewoo notified of the decision?

Mr Richardson: We would need to take that on notice. Navantia and Daewoo were advised over the last several weeks. That was very recent. The actual decision was taken within a couple of weeks of that, prior.

Senator CONROY: Prior, did you say?

Mr Richardson: Yes. You have the decision; then you have—

Senator CONROY: Who makes that decision? Is it the Defence Capability and Investment Committee?

Mr Richardson: No, not the decision. The Defence Capability and Investment Committee is the committee in Defence—which has now been replaced by the investment committee—that considers the final proposal going to the minister and the government.

Senator CONROY: On what day did the Defence Capability and Investment Committee make a decision?

Mr Richardson: I would need to take that on notice.

Senator CONROY: Mr Nicholl?

Mr Nicholl: I could not give you a specific date. I will take it on notice and follow up.

Answer:

The decision to select Navantia as the preferred tenderer for the supply ships (SEA 1654 Phase 3) was taken by the appropriate Defence delegate on 10 November 2015.

Defence notified Navantia and Daewoo of the outcome of the initial request for tender evaluations on 8 March 2016.

Defence then undertook Offer Definition Improvement Activity/Negotiations with the preferred tenderer, Navantia.

The Defence Capability and Investment Committee considered the final documentation that would be presented to Government seeking Second Pass approval on 10 March 2016.

Second Pass approval for SEA 1654 Phase 3 was provided by the Government on 17 April 2016.

On 5 May 2016, Defence signed Acquisition and Support contracts with Navantia for the design, build and initial five years of in-service support.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Shipbuilding - AWD

Question reference number: 162

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: asked on Thursday, 17 March 2016, Hansard page 6

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator CONROY: Do you dispute the testimony to a Senate committee on 21 July 2014 by the then Chief Executive of Defence SA, Mr Andrew Fletcher, who said that the necessary upgrades could be made for between \$20 to \$50 million and would only take between 12 and 24 months?

Senator Payne: I have not seen that evidence, but I am happy to take that question on notice.

Senator CONROY: Mr Fletcher also told the Senate committee that upgrades at Techport could be done while modules were built and the supply ships assembled—in other words, that the upgrades would not hamper the build. Do you dispute that?

Senator Payne: As I said, I have not seen that evidence. As we all know, we also have the ongoing construction of the three Air Warfare Destroyers at the shipyards as well. I do not know whether Mr Fletcher took that into account. I will take the question on notice.

Senator CONROY: He was the Chief Executive of Defence SA at the time. I am sure that he would be familiar with the AWD builds.

Senator Payne: I am not canvassing the role of Mr Fletcher—whom I do not know—then, now or otherwise. I am simply saying that I am not sure what was in Mr Fletcher's mind. In fact, I could not possibly be required to be sure what was in Mr Fletcher's mind. I will have a look at the evidence which was given, take that on notice and provide you with a response.

Answer:

The upgrades required at ASC to construct an Auxiliary Oiler Replenishment Ship were judged to be significant, embracing shiplift, cranes, module hall and hard stands. Defence does not consider that upgrading the facilities to create a large ship capacity could have been done without impact on existing programs.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Shipbuilding – Preferred Tenderer – Internal Processes

Question reference number: 163

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: asked on Thursday, 17 March 2016

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

Senator CONROY: What was the internal Defence decision making process for selecting Navantia as the preferred tenderer? We were asking a little bit about this before. Was the matter considered by the Defence Capability and Investment Committee? I think we said it was.

Mr Richardson: Yes.

Senator CONROY: You chair that, Mr Richardson. Were you there for this decision?

Mr Richardson: Yes.

Senator CONROY: What was your role in the process, if I can ask this without spending too much time on it—so, concisely. I did ask what date did it consider the matter and finalise the matter earlier.

Mr Richardson: I had an initial discussion with people involved prior to the Defence Capability and Investment Committee meeting. In the meeting itself, a presentation was made by the group head or service chief—whoever is relevant—

Senator CONROY: So Vice Admiral Barrett did that?

Mr Richardson: I cannot recall now. Very often it is. Then we go around the table. We have each of the service chiefs there, the CDF, the VCDF and the group heads. We have relevant other people who know the detail of the particular matter more than others. They are there to provide input and to respond to any questions and the like. From there, it goes to the minister and then normally to the NSC.

Senator CONROY: There were a few acronyms tossed in there. Vice Admiral Griggs, were you part of that process?

Vice Adm. Griggs: I am not sure I was at that particular meeting.

Senator CONROY: You are on that committee?

Vice Adm. Griggs: I am on the committee, yes.

Senator CONROY: But you do not make the presentation?

Vice Adm. Griggs: No.

Senator CONROY: You would have in the old days, before you were promoted?

Vice Adm. Griggs: Generally.

Senator CONROY: Does anyone else remember who made the presentation? Was it Vice Admiral Barrett?

Mr Richardson: We would need to take that on notice.

Answer:

The SEA1654 Phase 3 – Maritime Operational Support Capability Project was just one project considered as part of a suite of projects by the Defence Capability Investment Committee. There was no formal presentation as such, but discussions occurred around the maturity of a proposal to be taken to Government.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Submarines – Communication System

Question reference number: 164

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: asked on 17 March 2016, Hansard page 13

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator CONROY: I will probably come back to that particular line of questioning. We have talked about a combat system, so I now want to talk about a communication system. Which Australian communication system is going to be fitted?

Mr Nicholl: I would have to take on notice the specific details of that, but it is common with all the other communication systems we have fitted across the Australian fleet—

Senator CONROY: I would hope so!

Mr Nicholl: which I believe are Australian sourced.

Answer:

There are a number of Australian communications systems subcontractors being competitively considered for the SEA1654 Phase 3 project. Detail on local industry activities for combat and communication systems remain subject to negotiation with the preferred tenderer during current Offer Definition and Improvement Activities, and will be published in the public version of the Australian Industry Capability Plan following contract award.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Supply ships – Australian Content

Question reference number: 165

Senator: Xenophon

Type of question: asked on Thursday, 17 March 2016, Hansard page 13

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

Senator XENOPHON: It is not being pedantic. There must be some rigor in terms of how you define Australian content. The government made a statement about \$100 million for the supply ships. Can you tell us not only how that figure is derived, but how you work out whether it is Australian content or not. How do we know that it is not 50 per cent, 60 per cent, 70 per cent of something that was built overseas and imported into the country? There is no specificity in terms of what Australian content is. There must be some easy definition, so that you can put us out of our misery on this. You are going to put me out of my misery on this. I just want to know what the definition of Australian content is? Can someone tell me what 'Australian content' means for the purpose of the \$100 million reference in relation to the supply ships.

Vice Adm. Griggs: I think the safest way to do this is to take that on notice, because—

Senator XENOPHON: You cannot even tell us something as basic as that?

Vice Adm. Griggs: It is not a matter of whether it is basic or not. We do not want to mislead you in any way. We will get you an answer on those exact—

Senator XENOPHON: I am not suggesting you want to mislead us at all, Vice Admiral. But I would have thought, given that the government said there would be \$100 million worth of Australian content, that there would have been an assumption as to what Australian content is before that announcement was made.

Vice Adm. Griggs: I am sure there was.

(.....)

Senator XENOPHON: I think that further to that, Mr Richardson, you made mention—and thank you for at least giving some further details of that—of components made in Australia. How do you define 'made in Australia'? Is it 51 per cent local content? What does 'components brought together in Australia' mean? Does that mean that if you import products you include the value of those imported products?

Mr Richardson: I certainly would need to take that degree of detail on notice. That is beyond my level of knowledge.

Senator CONROY: So just to be clear: the \$100 million has not been secured yet. It is still in negotiation.

Mr Richardson: That is the estimated value. What the government put out—what the minister stated—was very much on the recommendation of the Department of Defence. There will be detail sitting behind that—

Senator CONROY: That is what we are trying to get to.

Mr Richardson: and we will—

Senator CONROY: You seem unclear.

Mr Richardson: take that on notice. I have provided the detail that we can. We will take that on notice and provide you with further detail.

(.....)

Senator CONROY: I am just clarifying that the \$100 million is still up for negotiation. I think this is what you said, Mr Richardson—you have not finalised it yet.

Mr Richardson: It is our estimate. It is \$100 million. The minister made that statement on our advice, and we believe that is an accurate statement.

Senator CONROY: Except you do not actually have a definition of what 'Australian made' would be. So to satisfy Senator Xenophon and us, what you have counted as Australian content we would count as Australian content?

Mr Richardson: I have provided you with the information that we have, and I have said that we would take the more detailed questions on notice.

Answer:

Local industry activities are implemented to meet the level of Australian industry involvement agreed during the procurement process. In accordance with Defence Australian Industry Capability policy, detail on local industry activities will vary depending on the nature of the procurement and proposed Australian industry involvement.

The Australia industry capability subcontracts for the SEA1654 Phase 3 – Maritime Operational Support Capability Project are valued at in excess of \$120 million and cover the local industry activities listed below:

- supply of communications systems;
- supply of combat management systems;
- integrated logistics support package; and
- supply of elements of onboard cranes.

There is potential for other Australian industry capability subcontractors, including for the supply of Australian steel.

Other Australian industry involvement in the project may also include weapon systems (i.e. Close-In Weapon System), facility upgrades and engagement of subject matter expertise such as specialist engineering support.

There will also be significant ongoing benefit for Australian industry in undertaking the proposed support contract. The full extent of local industry activities will be confirmed through the course of the project. It is estimated that the support and maintenance services to be conducted through the life of type will be in the vicinity of \$875 million.

Senate Standing Committees on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Shipbuilding – Australian Work

Question reference number: 166

Senator: Xenophon

Type of question: asked on Thursday, 17 March 2016, Hansard page 16

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

Senator XENOPHON: All up, by value, how much work was carried out in Australia on the LHD?

Rear Adm. Dalton: I would have to take that on notice.

Senator XENOPHON: I understand it was about a \$3 billion program. Would it be fair to say that about 25 per cent of the work was done here?

Rear Adm. Dalton: I would have to take that on notice.

Senator XENOPHON: Does that seem a reasonable figure?

Rear Adm. Dalton: I will have to take that on notice.

Senator XENOPHON: Okay, but it is more than five per cent, isn't it?

Rear Adm. Dalton: It is more than five per cent, but it is a very different program.

Answer:

The total value of Australian industry capability under the LHD Acquisition Contract to date equates to circa \$760 million.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Budget Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Shipbuilding – Unsolicited proposal

Question reference number: 167

Senator: Xenophon

Type of question: asked on Thursday, 17 March 2016, Hansard page 16

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

Senator XENOPHON: Going to issues of time available, are you aware that both ASC and BAE made, as I understand it, unsolicited offers to Defence or perhaps to Defence Materiel to say, 'We can build three for the price of two'? My understanding of the ASC offer was that the first ship was to be built in Korea with about 20 per cent of the value here in Australia, and then there would be a reversal where the majority of the value was going to be in Australia for the remaining two ships. Are you aware of any of those? It is something I have alluded to previously with you, Mr Richardson.

Rear Adm. Dalton: I am not personally aware of it.

Senator XENOPHON: Were you aware of that, Mr Nicholl?

Mr Nicholl: No, I was not.

Vice Adm. Griggs: I think that is incorrect—it was two ships in Korea and one in Australia.

Senator XENOPHON: But this was an offer that was made by ASC?

Senator Payne: There was an unsolicited proposal, yes.

Senator XENOPHON: When was that unsolicited proposal from ASC made?

Senator Payne: I am not sure. I think it was in the middle of 2013 or thereabouts.

Senator XENOPHON: Minister, could you please take on notice what assessment was carried out of that proposal and how it was dealt with?

Senator Payne: Yes, sure.

Answer:

The unsolicited proposal from ASC was never formally submitted to Defence, and therefore was not considered in accordance with chapter 4.12 of the Defence Procurement Policy Manual.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Shipbuilding – Decision Making

Question reference number: 168

Senator: Xenophon

Type of question: asked on Thursday, 17 March 2016, Hansard page 17

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Mr Richardson: That is right, yes.

Senator XENOPHON: Are you in a position to be able to table the advice as it passed through the various Defence decision-making committees—for instance the Defence capability committee or the Defence Capability and Investment Committee?

Mr Richardson: I would need to take that on notice, because there could be certain confidentiality around that. I would just need to check.

Senator XENOPHON: But on notice could you provide details on what you say the price differential would have been.

Mr Richardson: Sure.

Answer:

The advice considered by the Defence decision making committees was used to inform Cabinet considerations and therefore cannot be released.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Naval Shipbuilding Plan

Question reference number: 169

Senator: Xenophon

Type of question: asked on Thursday, 17 March 2016, Hansard page 34

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

Senator XENOPHON: You may want to take this on notice because I know, Minister, you made reference to the Defence Teaming Centre and that Mr Chris Burns made reference to this back in August last year: the Defence Teaming Centre undertook an analysis that showed that South Australia could get just \$8 billion of the promised \$39 billion for surface shipbuilding. I am very happy for you to take that on notice, but that does indicate a fairly small proportion of that.

Senator PAYNE: I think you have referred to that before, Senator. If I thought you were glass half-empty, it has nothing on that analysis.

Senator XENOPHON: So you are calling me an optimist now?

Senator PAYNE: Well it is a chameleon-like environment, the politics of the Senate, isn't it, Senator Xenophon? I did indicate in the chamber today that I thought Mr Burns' comments in relation to the naval shipbuilding plan, which I saw published this morning, were in fact very relevant and I think you will see I endorsed them.

Senator XENOPHON: I am just trying to establish whether Defence is able to refute that—

Senator PAYNE: I will take that on notice because, obviously, I was not in this role at the time. I will take that on notice and come back to you.

Answer:

The breakdown of funding for surface shipbuilding will not be confirmed until the Government has considered the outcome of the competitive evaluation processes for the Offshore Patrol Vessels and Future Frigates.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Shipbuilding - Jobs

Question reference number: 170

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: asked on Thursday, 17 March 2016, Hansard page 42

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

Senator CONROY: No, I am saying that Minister Andrews claimed 500 new jobs. Of what you have described, some of those jobs already exist and have existed for a while. I am asking you where the new jobs have been created since 20 February.

Mr Richardson: We in fact are in the process of recruiting a significant number of additional people, particularly in the design area, and quite a number of those jobs will in fact be in South Australia.

Senator CONROY: Could you give me a definition of 'significant number' and 'quite a few in South Australia'. Can you give me some breakdowns there. Is it 36?

Mr Richardson: No.

Senator Payne: If you want details, we will take that on notice. We have that detail.

Answer:

Defence has commenced the process of recruiting personnel to support ongoing work on the Collins class and the Future Submarine Program. Over the period to 2019, this workforce will grow to 160 positions in South Australia, with around 100 working on Future Submarine design assurance.

Details of jobs generated by industry will be determined as work commences with DCNS and the selected Combat System Integrator for the Future Submarine Program later in 2016.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Future Submarine Combat System - Budget

Question reference number: 171

Senator: Xenophon

Type of question: asked on Thursday, 17 March 2016, Hansard page 44

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator XENOPHON: I can put them verbally on the record, and that might be useful, and then maybe put a couple of supplementary ones on notice. I will run through them and please interrupt if there is a lack of clarity with respect to the questions. Could I ask for a rough order budget for this preferred system—that is, the AN/BYG-1—being transferred from Collins to the Future Submarines? Obviously that would include issues of software and hardware costs. I note that the cost to purchase and install the six systems in Collins was \$139 million. That was question on notice No. 2487 in July 2015. So there is a reference point there.

(.....) Another one: we know from Defence answers that we pay 15 per cent of the joint program cost, or \$20 million per annum—question on notice No. 2487 July 2015—for the evolving development program that excludes Australian companies—

Mr Cochrane: I do not believe that that was our response.

Senator XENOPHON: Wasn't it?

Mr Cochrane: It does not exclude Australian companies.

Senator XENOPHON: That was my interpretation of the response. I think your response made reference to 15 per cent or \$20 million?

Senator Payne: We will deal with that in our response.

Senator XENOPHON: Yes, as to whether it excludes Australian companies or not. With 12 submarines, would this likely go up to 25 to 30 per cent? Would that be in the order of \$35 million to \$40 million per annum? And I am just trying to establish whether you think that is a reasonable ballpark figure. In terms of sonar, which is an important part, obviously, of a submarine combat system, how much in broad terms of this would be allocated for in this \$5 billion? I note that the white paper states that the Collins sonar upgrade would be \$750,000 million to \$1 billion. Are you looking at moving that system from Collins to future submarines as they are for the command and control system? If I could put that on notice. (.....)

Senator XENOPHON: For periscopes and optronics, how much for that? For communications—and I know it is not an apples for apples comparison—my understanding is that the communications upgrade on the eight Anzacs is marked at \$500 million to \$700 million. With respect to communications, it is an area where interoperability is important. Will there be any restriction on the country of origin of this supplier? I presume, if it were the case, it would be a US or NATO country. I just ask because of interoperability. In terms of the electronic surveillances, what will the cost of the electronic surveillance system be? I understand that the Anzac upgrade is

listed at \$250 million. I am just trying to establish that. (.....) Finally, as to weapons, at the top level—and I understand there are issues of national security—we do know that, in terms of the Mark 48 torpedoes, the cost of the Collins torpedoes was \$427 million in ANAO report. How much reuse would there be? With the harpoon anti-ship missiles, the anti-aircraft missiles, the Tomahawks and the mines, in so far as this information does not compromise national security I think the ANAO did make reference to the costs involved. I do not necessarily want to know how many missiles, for those that want to do us harm, but I just want to get an idea of that. (.....) In terms of integration, the plan seems to be that either Raytheon or Lockheed will be the integrators. If you can just provide details of the tender out for the integrated role—

Mr Cochrane: What kind of details would you be after, Senator?

Senator XENOPHON: Is there a tender for the integrator?

Mr Cochrane: There is a limited tender.

Senator XENOPHON: So that is between Raytheon or Lockheed—is that right?

Senator Payne: Yes.

Senator XENOPHON: So it is out of them two—okay. I might put some questions on notice in respect of the command and control system because there was a situation back in, I think, 2001 where the Germans missed out because there was a decision made for the US system to be used—which, I understand, was much more expensive, but I think there were some strategic decisions made.

Mr Cochrane: I might just correct that, if I may, Senator. The comparisons we have indicate that it certainly is on a par. The expense of that system that you just indicated would have been about the same as the purchase and adaptation of AN/BYG-1 into Collins.

Senator Payne: We can expand on that on notice.

Senator XENOPHON: But a decision has been made on the AN/BYG, but you cannot tell me what the cost is of that?

Senator Payne: We will come back to you on notice. I appreciate the detail that you are putting on the record. Thank you.

Answer:

1. **Question:** *Could I ask for a rough order budget for this preferred system—that is, the AN/BYG-1—being transferred from Collins to the Future Submarines?*

In Senate QON 2487 tabled 21 October 2015, costs attributed to the initial installation of AN/BYG-1 into all six Collins class submarines were \$138.3 million. While indicative procurement and sustainment costs for the Future Submarine version of AN/BYG-1 can be modelled to some extent from the equivalent costs for Collins, there will be differences and actual costs will be refined during the Future Submarine design process.

2. **Question:** *Yes, as to whether it excludes Australian companies or not.*

This question was answered in the response to QON 65 from Supplementary Budget Estimates in October 2015 and tabled 5 February 2016. Australian companies are not excluded.

3. **Question:** *I think your response made reference to 15 per cent or \$20 million? With 12 submarines, would this likely go up to 25 to 30 per cent? Would that be in the order of \$35 million to \$40 million per annum?*

The percentage contribution of Australia's future involvement in the AN/BYG-1 program will be determined during negotiations with the United States Government that will take place in the coming years. The contribution is expected to relate to the scope of the cooperation rather than the number of submarines.

4. **Question:** *In terms of sonar, which is an important part, obviously, of a submarine combat system, how much in broad terms of this would be allocated for in this \$5 billion? I note that the white paper states that the Collins sonar upgrade would be \$750,000 million to \$1 billion. Are you looking at moving that system from Collins to future submarines as they are for the command and control system?*

The \$5 billion dollar amount referred to in the question is understood to be based on an amount shown in the recent Integrated Investment Program, page 77, which shows an allocation of 5-6 billion dollars for 'Future Submarines Program – Weapons & Systems'. This does not cover the combat system or any of its subsystems. The combat system allocation for the Future Submarine is included in the overall allocation for 'Future Submarine Program – Evaluation, Design & Construction' (>\$50 billion). The allocation for the combat system and associated subsystems, including periscopes and optronics, sonar, electronic surveillance and weapons, will be refined as the Future Submarine design matures.

It is unlikely that any current systems will be 'moved from Collins to Future Submarines'. Some systems used in Collins will be evolved and transition to the Future Submarine; other systems will be selected or developed specifically for the Future Submarine.

5. **Question:** *For periscopes and optronics, how much for that? In terms of the electronic surveillances, what will the cost of the electronic surveillance system be? For Communications? For Weapons?*

See response to question 4.

6. **Question:** *For Communications?... Will there be any restriction on the country of origin of this supplier?*

The full requirements for the Future Submarine communications system are yet to be finalised, but that system will contribute to interoperability. At this stage, there has been no consideration to restrict the country of origin.

7. **Question:** *in terms of the Mark 48 torpedoes, ... How much reuse would there be?*

The Defence White Paper identifies that the main armament of the Future Submarine will be 'upgraded versions of the... Mark 48 Mod 7 heavyweight torpedo jointly developed between the United States and Australia'. The ongoing joint development program delivers these upgraded versions for use

in United States and Australian submarines. These weapons would be deployed in both Collins and the Future Submarine.

8. ***Question:** there was a decision made for the US system to be used—which, I understand, was much more expensive, but I think there were some strategic decisions made.*

The comparison of costs of the relevant systems is detailed in the response to QON 31 from Supplementary Budget Estimates in October 2015 and tabled 3 December 2015.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Future Submarine Combat System Tender Process

Question reference number: 172

Senator: Xenophon

Type of question: asked on Thursday, 17 March 2016, Hansard page 45

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator XENOPHON: I guess the issue is: I am just trying to understand how the procurement rules and the tender processes work for this, because \$5 billion to \$6 billion, albeit over a 30-year period, is still a significant amount of money. On notice, through you, Minister, if we can get some details of the tender process—

Senator Payne: All right. Yes—certainly.

Senator XENOPHON: because there has been an issue with local defence contractors—Australian-based companies—where they have expressed concern in the past over tender processes for that down the supply chain where they felt Australian industry participation has been unnecessarily limited. This is something that goes back over a number of years.

Senator Payne: We will come back to you on that.

Answer:

Defence is conducting a limited tender selection process to choose a partner for the role of Combat System Integrator (CSI). Both respondents are Australian-based.

One of the selection criteria that the respondents will be evaluated against is:

‘Demonstrated commitment and ability to maximise Australian industry involvement through all phases of the design and integration of the Australian Submarine Combat System (ASCS) without compromising capability, cost, program schedule and risk.’

A key assumption provided to the respondents was that *‘the systems integration of combat systems components will take place in Australia’*. In order to ensure that sensitive data is adequately controlled, this integration will occur in a dedicated Australian facility.

The CSI limited tender closed on 7 April 2016. An evaluation of the responses has commenced.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Budget Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence Industry Policy Statement

Question reference number: 173

Senator: Gallacher

Type of question: asked on Thursday, 17 March 2016, Hansard page 48

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator GALLACHER: Can you please detail the 35 Defence industry programs that were cancelled as part of the Defence industry policy statement to fund new initiatives.

CHAIR: Read them out.

Ms Louis: The programs fall under a number of different categories across innovation, business government, engagement and skilling. Maybe if I just talk to the key ones, they would be along the lines of the Capability and Technology Demonstrator Program—

Senator GALLACHER: When are you going to tell us which ones were cancelled?

Senator Payne: Senator Gallacher, could you possibly at least give the officer sufficient respect to let her commence her answer?

Senator GALLACHER: I thought the question was fairly straightforward. I did not get the idea that I was going to get an answer.

CHAIR: Thanks, Ms Louis. You can continue.

Ms Louis: Continue reading them out?

Senator Payne: Yes, thank you, Kate.

Ms Louis: Next is the Defence Materials Technology Centre, then the CDG Priority Industry Capability Innovation Program, the Defence Innovation Realisation Fund, the RPDE—which is the Rapid Prototyping, Development and Evaluation Program—the Defence Industry Innovation Board, the Australian Industry Capability Program, the Defence Industry Innovation Centre, the Defence Industry Innovation Centre Advisory Committee, the Defence Export Unit, the Australian Government Defence Export Support Forum and the Joint Strike Fighter Industry Program. You can see there are quite a few. Also, the DMO Global Supply Chain Program, a number of the environmental working groups, the Capability Development Advisory Forum, the DMO Business Access Offices. If you would like me to keep going, the skilling programs include Skilling Australia's Defence Industry, DMO School Pathways, the DMO Defence Engineering Internship Program, the DMO sponsoring the Re-engineering Australia Foundation, the DSTO undergraduate scholarship programs and so on. The idea is that all of these are not, obviously, being stopped immediately or anything like that. We are looking at these and bringing them under the two broad initiatives in the industry policy statement.

Senator Payne: If I may interrupt, would you like to explain those, please?

Ms Louis: Certainly. We did a very comprehensive consultation process in the industry policy statement. A lot of the feedback to us was that these programs were quite fragmented. They needed to be brought together under a strategic leadership. We are looking at the two initiatives announced in the industry policy statement: the new innovation approach and the new Centre for Defence Industry Capability.

Senator GALLACHER: That is the complete list? The whole 35 have been itemised there? Ms Louis: I must admit, I abbreviated some of them that come under groupings, but I can give you the whole list—

Senator Payne: We will take further detail on notice for you, Senator.

Answer:

Consultation during development of the Defence Industry Policy Statement demonstrated the need to streamline the numerous programs. The following is a list of the programs under detailed design review for streamlining into the two key initiatives – the Centre for Defence Industry Capability and the new approach to innovation.

Industry Programs and Engagement Fora				
	Industry development			
Innovation	Local	Export	Engagement	Skilling
CDG Capability and Technology Demonstration Program (CTD)	Australian Industry Capability Program (AIC)	DMO Defence Export Unit / Team Defence Australia	CDG Environmental Working Groups	DMO Skilling Australia's Defence Industry
DMO Defence Materials Technology Centre (DMTC)	DMO Defence Industry Innovation Centre (DIIC)	DMO Australian Government Defence Export Support Forum	DMO and DSRG CEO Roundtables	DMO School Pathways (ISPE)
CDG PIC Innovation Program/ Development Fund	DMO Defence Industry Innovation Centre Advisory Committee	DMO JSF Industry Program	CDG Capability Development Advisory Forum	DMO Defence Engineering Internship Program (ISPE)
DSTO Defence Innovation Realisation Fund (DIRF)	Priority Industry Capability Framework	DMO Global Supply Chain Program	DMO Business Access Offices	DMO Sponsoring Re-Engineering Australia Foundation
CDG Rapid Prototyping, Development and Evaluation Program (RPDE)			DMO Industry Conferences	DSTO Undergraduate scholarship program for female students
DSTO Grand Challenge			VCDF, DSRG and DMO engagement with industry peak bodies	DSTO Industry Experience Program/Graduate Industry Placement
DMO Defence Innovation Industry Board				DMO Defence and industry study course

Industry Programs and Engagement Fora				
	Industry development			
Innovation	Local	Export	Engagement	Skilling
DSTO Defence Innovation Forum				DMO Institute
Defence co-funding of cooperative research centres				DMO Creating and enabling work pathways
DSTO strategic research investment program				
CIOG Innovation Fund				
DSTO Eureka Sponsorship				

CDG – Capability Development Group
 CIOG – Chief Information Officer Group
 DMO – Defence Materiel Organisation
 DSRG – Defence Support and Reform Group
 DSTO – Defence Science and Technology Organisation
 PIC – Priority Industry Capability
 VCDF – Vice Chief of the Defence Force

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Budget Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence Industry Policy - Cost

Question reference number: 174

Senator: Gallacher

Type of question: asked on Thursday, 17 March 2016, Hansard page 48

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Senator GALLACHER: Fantastic. The recognition of the defence industry as a fundamental input to capability, FIC, has been well received and is supported by Labor. Does the department have any plan to map the scale and capabilities of the defence industry across Australia?

Ms Louis: We certainly do. The Defence Industry Policy Statement notes that we will be developing an industry capability plan for government consideration. It goes exactly to that heart. We do think we need to map the industry capabilities in a more strategic way than we have previously.

Senator GALLACHER: Just the nuts and bolts of that—who would be conducting that activity?

Ms Louis: That will be conducted by the Centre for Defence Industry Capability, obviously with very close links with Defence. It is important to work with Defence in identifying those sovereign capabilities and then the industrial capabilities that underpin those.

Senator GALLACHER: Is there any estimation of the cost of that activity?

Ms Louis: No. I would have to take that on notice.

Answer:

A refined cost estimate for this activity is subject to the detailed design and implementation of the Centre for Defence Industry Capability, which is currently underway.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Naval Shipbuilding Plan

Question reference number: 175

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

- (1) Can Defence please outline the scope and purpose of the enterprise-level Naval Shipbuilding Plan?
- (2) In the Ministerial foreword to the 2015-16 Defence Budget brochure, then Defence Minister Andrews stated that: “In conjunction with the White Paper, the Government will publish a fully costed 10 year Defence Investment Plan, a Defence Industry Policy Statement and an enterprise-level Naval Shipbuilding Plan.” Was this commitment to release the Naval Shipbuilding Plan in conjunction with the Defence White Paper based on, or consistent with, advice from Defence at the time?
 - (a) Did Defence subsequently recommend to Government that the Naval Shipbuilding Plan not be released in conjunction with the Defence White Paper?
 - If YES: On what date was this recommendation made to Government? What was Defence’s rationale for delaying release of the Naval Shipbuilding Plan?
 - If NO: When did Defence first become aware that the Government would not release the Naval Shipbuilding Plan in conjunction with the Defence White Paper?
- (3) Will the Naval Shipbuilding Plan contain any new shipbuilding and/or financial commitments above and beyond what is contained in the 2016 Defence White Paper?
- (4) Which area of Defence is responsible for drafting the Naval Shipbuilding Plan?
 - (a) How many staff are dedicated to drafting the Naval Shipbuilding Plan?
 - (b) When did drafting of the Naval Shipbuilding Plan commence?
 - (c) When is drafting of the Naval Shipbuilding Plan expected to conclude?
 - (d) Has the Naval Shipbuilding Plan and/or a draft of the Naval Shipbuilding Plan, either in part or whole, been considered by or provided to the Minister for Defence, the Prime Minister and/or the National Security Committee of Cabinet? If so, on what date(s) did that occur?
 - (e) When does Defence anticipate that the Naval Shipbuilding Plan will be released?

Answer:

- (1) The Government is committed to releasing a Naval Shipbuilding Plan that brings together all of the elements of the Government's continuous naval shipbuilding strategy. The Government's unprecedented commitment to continuous naval shipbuilding will:
 - (a) support the strategic and capability needs of Defence;
 - (b) provide a viable, permanent naval shipbuilding industry;
 - (c) provide certainty for the naval shipbuilding workforce;
 - (d) deliver value for money;
 - (e) build commercial confidence; and
 - (f) promote the use of global best practice.
- (2.) Yes. Advice was provided to Government in the context of the finalisation of the 2016 Defence White Paper.
- (3) The 2016 Defence Budget provides the funding needed to deliver the capability plans set out in the 2016 White Paper, including plans for the Australian naval shipbuilding industry.
- (4) The Strategic Policy and Intelligence Group within the Department of Defence is responsible for drafting the Naval Shipbuilding Plan, in consultation with Navy, Capability Acquisition and Sustainment Group, the Chief Finance Officer Group, State and Territory Governments and defence industry. The continuous naval shipbuilding strategy will be a national endeavor, and will have significant flow-on effects for industry across Australia.
 - (a) As at 7 September 2016, 10 staff are dedicated to the drafting of the Naval Shipbuilding Plan.
 - (b) Early development of the Naval Shipbuilding Plan commenced during the 2016 White Paper process.
 - (c) The Government remains committed to releasing a Naval Shipbuilding Plan. The Government is conducting a strategic review of the workforce, skills and infrastructure needs to deliver key capabilities as part of the Naval Shipbuilding Plan.
 - (d) No.
 - (e) This is a matter for the Government.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Future Submarines – Advice to Government

Question reference number: 176

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

- (1) On 2 March 2016, a spokesperson for former Prime Minister Abbott said:
“As prime minister, Defence advised Mr Abbott that it was feasible for Australia's new submarines to start entering service in the second half of the next decade”. (Ref: <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-03-02/defence-leak-to-be-investigated/7214470>)

Is it correct that Defence provided this advice to Mr Abbott? If so, when?

- (2) During a spill-over hearing of Additional Estimates on 3 March 2016, Secretary Richardson said: *“We have consistently advised government that it was highly unlikely that the first of the Future Submarines could be delivered by 2026 and that an extension of life for the Collins class submarine would almost certainly be required.”*

Did Defence ever provide advice to the Abbott Government – notwithstanding the potential for increased risk, cost and/or schedule slippage – that the first of the Future Submarines could potentially be delivered in the 2020s?

Answer:

- (1) No.
- (2) No.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Future Submarines – Competitive Evaluation Process and Submarine Requirement

Question reference number: 177

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (1) The 2016 Defence White Paper confirms that Australia will acquire 12 Future Submarines.
 - (a) On what date were the participants in the Future Submarine Competitive Evaluation Process advised that the build would be for 12 submarines?
 - (b) What was the baseline requirement for the number of submarines that participants were asked to meet when the Competitive Evaluation Process commenced last year?
 - (i) Has this requirement changed at any point and, if so, when?
- (2) It was revealed during Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016 that Defence had changed the contractual terms for the participants in the Future Submarine Competitive Evaluation Process through the issuing of a Data Item Description – a DID. In response to Senator Xenophon’s questioning during Additional Estimates on 10 February 2016, Rear Admiral Sammut said: “We have asked for more information and we put that out in the form of a DID, yes.”
 - (a) Why was the DID issued?
 - (b) What additional information was requested from the participants?
 - (c) Was it the case that one of the participants did not meet the original requirements of the Competitive Evaluation Process? If so, which participant was it?
 - (d) Have any further DIDs been issued in addition to the one revealed during Additional Estimates on 10 February? If so, when and what did they pertain to?

Answer:

- (1)(a) and (b) The aim of the Competitive Evaluation Process was to inform Government's decision on the most suitable international partner to work with Australia to develop and deliver a regionally superior Future Submarine with sovereign control over its operation and sustainment. The outcome of the process was not dependent on the final size of the Future Submarine fleet, which was announced in the 2016 Defence White Paper.
- (2)(a) and (b) Refer to response provided under Question on Notice 53 part (a) from 10 February 2016 Additional Estimates Hearing.
- (2)(c) No.
- (2)(d) No.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Future Submarines – Design and Construction

Question reference number: 178

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

The Government has said that the outcomes of the Future Submarine Competitive Evaluation Process will be announced in 2016. Page 89 of the Integrated Investment Program lists “Future Submarine Program – Design and Construction” as commencing in 2018.

- (a) Given the results of the Competitive Evaluation Process will be announced in 2016, why does the ‘Design and Construction’ phase not commence until 2018?
- (b) What will occur between the Competitive Evaluation Process announcement in 2016 and the start of the ‘Design and Construction’ phase in 2018?

Answer:

(a) and (b). The Integrated Investment Program lists the broad timeframe for design and construction of the Future Submarine as 2018 to 2057. This does not preclude Defence from commencing design activities sooner.

As announced by Government on 26 April 2016, DCNS of France has been selected as the preferred international partner to work with Australia to design the Future Submarine. Design work will commence by the end of this year.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Future Submarines – Rolling Acquisition Program

Question reference number: 179

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

Paragraph 4.28 of the Defence White Paper states in part that: “*the Government has decided to implement a rolling acquisition program for Australia’s submarine fleet*”.

- (a) Can Defence please explain what a ‘rolling acquisition program’ involves?
- (b) How does a ‘rolling acquisition program’ differ from a ‘continuous build’ program?
- (c) What implications will a ‘rolling acquisition program’ have for the Future Submarine contract? How will it be structured?
- (d) Under the ‘rolling acquisition program’, will Government place an order for 12 submarines – or will the submarines be purchased in smaller, separate batches?

Answer:

- (a) As explained in the Defence White Paper, a rolling acquisition program will ensure that Australia is able to maintain a fleet of 12 regionally superior submarines as submarine and anti-submarine technologies develop over the coming decades. This involves a review, based on strategic circumstances and developments in submarine technology, in the late 2020s to consider whether the Future Submarine configuration remains suitable or whether the other specifications should be considered. It also involves progression of the development of a replacement submarine in the 2050s.
- (b) A rolling acquisition program encompasses the need, as necessary, for upgrades to the Future Submarine over the course of the construction of the fleet. It does not necessarily imply ongoing construction, but recognises the need to develop a replacement for the Future Submarine in the 2050s to avoid a capability gap.
- (c) and (d) There will be a range of contracts for the development and delivery of the Future Submarine, which will vary in nature and structure as the program matures throughout the design and construction of the fleet.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Future Submarines – Rolling Acquisition program - Review

Question reference number: 180

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Paragraph 4.29 of the Defence White Paper states in part that: “As part of the rolling acquisition program, a review based on strategic circumstances at the time, and developments in submarine technology, will be conducted in the late 2020s to consider whether the configuration of the submarines remains suitable or whether consideration of other specifications should commence”.

- (a) Could Defence please expand on the purpose of this review?
- (b) Will the review of the “configuration of the submarines” extend to fundamental elements such as hull design – or will it be limited to systems and sensors?
- (c) Under this approach, could Australia end up with a fleet comprising different variants of Future Submarine?
- (d) What impact does Defence assess this approach might have on sustainment and training? Does it have the potential to increase cost and complexity by having different variants of the Future Submarines?
- (e) If the review finds that the configuration should be changed or updated, would those changes be integrated into the first submarine of the fleet or would they be integrated in later ‘batches’ of the submarines?

Answer:

(a) – (b) The rolling acquisition program for the submarine fleet means managing the acquisition of submarines to ensure Australia maintains, over the long term, a fleet of 12 regionally superior boats that remain fit for purpose over the period they will be constructed and then operated. To do this, Defence will look at the strategic circumstances in the late 2020s to consider updates needed to requirements for the submarines. This will continue to maintain regional superiority in the future.

(c) and (e) It will be important that the initial design of the Future Submarine includes some capacity to incorporate new technologies. This will minimise variations to the configuration of the submarines, and improve our ability to fit new technologies to submarines already constructed (as has happened in the case of the Collins class).

(d) As has occurred with the Collins fleet, sustainment and training would be adapted as required to accommodate upgrades to the submarines. This ensures the effectiveness of the fleet is maintained as the threat environment evolves. The impact on costs would depend on the nature of the change. In some cases, technology updates can improve sustainment costs.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Budget Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence Industry Programs

Question reference number: 181

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Can Defence please detail the 35 defence industry programs that were cancelled and/or redirected as part of the 2016 Defence Industry Policy Statement to fund new initiatives?

Answer:

This question has been answered under Additional Estimates 2016, Question on Notice 173.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Budget Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Centre for Defence Industry Capability

Question reference number: 182

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (1) According to the 2016 Defence Industry Policy Statement, the Centre for Defence Industry Capability is funded at \$23 million per year “which will be redirected from existing defence industry programs funding”. Can Defence please advise which existing programs have been cancelled and/or redirected to fund the Centre for Defence Industry Capability?
- (2) Can Defence please explain how the Centre for Defence Industry Capability represents a change in activity or scope of work in the Defence industry space?
 - (a) How has the ‘Australian Industry Capability’ program changed?
 - (b) How has the ‘Global Supply Chain’ program changed?

Answer:

(1) Please refer to Additional Budget Estimates 2016, Question on Notice 173.

(2)(a)&(2)(b). These questions were answered at the Additional Budget Estimates on 17 March 2016 by Ms Kate Louis, First Assistant Secretary Defence Industry Policy, Hansard page 47.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Budget Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Fundamental inputs to capability – Defence industry

Question reference number: 183

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (1) With respect to the recognition of Defence industry as a Fundamental Input to Capability, does Defence have any plans to map the scale and capabilities of Defence industry across Australia?
 - (a) Who will be conducting this activity?
 - (b) How much will this cost?
 - (c) How will the work remain up-to-date rather than static into the future?

Answer:

(1)(a)-(c) This was answered at the Additional Budget Estimates on 17 March 2016 by Ms Kate Louis, First Assistant Secretary Defence Industry Policy, Hansard page 48.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Budget Estimates –17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Integrated Investment Program

Question reference number: 184

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

With respect to the 2016 Integrated Investment Program, can Defence please explain:

- a) What strategies Defence is committed to so that it remains a 'smart customer'?
- b) How such a Foreign Military Sales (FMS) heavy acquisition program works to promote Australian defence industry or realise the objective of self-reliance?
- c) How this FMS heavy acquisition program works to support Australian research and development?
- d) What steps Defence is taking to promote a stronger exchange of personnel between itself and Defence industry?
- e) What steps the Services are taking in enabling men and women in uniform to transition between Defence and industry?
- f) Why the Integrated Investment Plan provides none of the level of programmatics that industry has seen previously?
- g) Why the Integrated Investment Plan uses inflation adjusted figures in its cost estimates?
- h) What is intended regarding an online 'Defence Capability Guide' to be published by the VCDF – and when it will be published?
- i) What will be the difference between the Defence Capability Guide and the Integrated Investment Plan?

Answer:

a) What strategies Defence is committed to so that it remains a 'smart customer'

Central to remaining a smart customer Defence continues to up-skill the organisation's commercial acumen through the delivery of both a professionalisation program for our procurement and contracting staff and a separate program for project and sustainment staff. This increased commercial acumen is supported by targeted more strategic engagement and intelligence gathering of key suppliers including the ability to analyse and report on supplier performance at project, program and portfolio level. In addition, Defence maintains subject matter experts in key technical fields critical to its operation as a smart customer.

b) How such a Foreign Military Sales (FMS) heavy acquisition program works to promote Australian defence industry or realize the objective of self-reliance? and c) How this FMS heavy acquisition program works to support Australian research and development?

These questions were answered at the Defence Additional Estimates Hearing on 17 March 2016 by RADM Tony Dalton, Head Joint Systems Division on page 48 of the Hansard.

d) What steps Defence is taking to promote a stronger exchange of personnel between itself and Defence industry? and e) What steps the Services are taking in enabling men and women in uniform to transition between Defence and industry?

The Integrated Investment Program envisages exchanges between Defence and industry into deeper areas of engagement which may involve different patterns of employment and exchange. Diversity of thinking and experience sharing will benefit both Defence and industry.

Through Project SUAKIN, Defence is enabling dual employment, whereby a Defence member will be able to divide their time between Australian Defence Force (ADF) service and working for a chosen industry partner. The policy aspects of this are still being developed.

Defence does not take any specific action to direct or encourage members towards any particular field of employment after they have separated from the ADF. Defence has a Career Transition Assistance Scheme (CTAS) that supports Defence members with transition to another career when they separate from the ADF. CTAS is not specifically targeted towards Defence industry although it could be used to support transition to Defence industry.

Project SUAKIN's dual employment service option will enable ADF members to work in industry and return to uniformed service, and vice versa, as Defence capability needs and the individual's circumstances require.

f) Why the Integrated Investment Plan provides none of the level of programmatics that industry has seen previously?

In developing the Integrated Investment Program, Defence moved away from the previous narrow approach focused on static lists of new military equipment, to instead present a more comprehensive view of future Defence capability.

The Integrated Investment Program now presents a much clearer rationale behind the development of the force over time, through capability streams with clear links to the White Paper's new strategic framework. Furthermore, for the first time, the Integrated Investment Program brings together plans for investment in information and communications technology, facilities and workforce growth into a single document.

This, along with a detailed description of funding in the White Paper, including all elements of the Defence budget (capital, sustainment, operating and workforce), represents an unprecedented level of transparency into Defence capability planning and provides a considerable level of information about the Government's plans over the decade to 2025-26.

This provides the platform to build a much closer and more strategic partnership with Australian defence industry, supported by the initiatives announced through the Defence Industry Policy Statement.

g) Why the Integrated Investment Plan uses inflation adjusted figures in its cost estimates?

The use of out-tuned dollars is the convention in developing Defence budgets, to enable consideration of overall project costs against future Australian Government and Defence budgets.

h) What is intended regarding an online 'Defence Capability Guide' to be published by VCDF – and when it will be published? And i) What will be the difference between the Defence Capability Guide and the Integrated Investment Plan?

There is no artefact titled '*Defence Capability Guide*'.

On 1 April 2016, Defence commenced transitioning to the new Capability Life Cycle (CLC). The new CLC addresses key recommendations from the Defence First Principles Review, specifically:

- *Key Recommendation 1 – Establish a strong, strategic centre to strengthen accountability and top level decision-making, and*
- *Key Recommendation 2 – Establish a single end-to-end capability development function within the Department to maximise the efficient, effective and professional delivery of military capability.*

The new CLC is informed by the 'CLC Detailed Design', which was approved by the First Principles Review Implementation Committee on 10 March 2016.

The CLC Detailed Design is an internal Defence policy document, which reinforces the alignment between strategy, capability and resources to provide options for the Government on the design of future Defence capability.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Budget Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence Industry Policy Statement – Culture and Processes

Question reference number: 185

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (1) Page 30 of the 2016 Defence Industry Policy Statement talks about changed culture and processes and declares that “Defence will change its culture and business processes” and it will “systemically remove barriers to innovation”. Could Defence please explain what these statements mean in practical terms?
- (2) Some commentators have observed that the leadership of Australian Defence Industry and the leadership of Defence are aligned in their thinking regarding developing deep partnerships between Defence and industry, and that the real adversary to this policy is found in the ranks of middle-management in CASG. How does Defence respond to this observation?

Answer:

- (1) A key element of the 2016 Defence Industry Policy Statement is recognition that Defence must reform its culture and business processes as part of the new Defence-industry partnership. This includes removing red tape experienced by Australian industry when engaging with Defence on innovation development.

In practical terms, Defence is implementing reforms and business processes in the new approach to innovation that removes or reduces red tape with a focus on development of new contracting and intellectual property policies. These activities will encourage investment in Australian ideas, keep profits in country, and provide incentives for larger companies to innovate in Australia.

- (2) Defence is committed to implementing the 2016 Defence Industry Policy Statement and recommendations identified in the First Principles Review that relate to improved industry engagement and relationships, and the recognition of industry as a Fundamental Input to Capability.

The Deputy Secretary Capability Acquisition and Sustainment Group (CASG) is strongly advocating these aspects to the entire CASG workforce through a series of senior leadership group discussions that are cascaded down the chain

of command and a nationwide road show that reaches CASG personnel at all levels.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Integrated Investment Program – Explosive Ordnance Facilities and Munitions

Question reference number: 186

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Page 61 of the Integrated Investment Program refers to \$300-\$400 million that will be spent on Explosive Ordnance Facilities and Munitions between 2017 and 2027.

- a) With reference to Figure 4.1 of ANAO Report No. 26 of 2015-16 (*'Defence's Management of the Mulwala Propellant Facility'*), can Defence please advise what proportion of ADF demand for propellant is met by the Mulwala and Benalla production?
- b) Can Defence please advise what proportion of ADF demand for munitions is met by the Mulwala and Benalla production, including but not limited to the following lines:
 - 9mm;
 - 5.56mm;
 - 12.7mm MP;
 - AP/APIT;
 - 20mm;
 - 25mm;
 - 30mm;
 - 40mm;
 - 81mm;
 - 155mm;
 - Renewed Grenades; and
 - Others.
- c) Can Defence please advise which production lines of ammunition and munitions are not produced at the Mulwala and Benalla production facilities and, as a consequence, must be purchased from elsewhere?
 - (i) From where are they purchased and what is the value of these purchases?
 - (ii) What are the barriers to this demand being satisfied by the Mulwala and Benalla production facilities?

- d) Has Defence undertaken any strategic study into its ammunition and munitions requirements? Please provide details of dates, authors and a summary of any conclusions reached.
- e) Has Defence considered how it might promote the long term sustainability of the Mulwala and Benalla production sites by either expanding the product range, or the volumes, of munitions produced at these facilities?
- f) Does Defence, with respect to the Major Munitions Contract (MMC), have a policy objective of promoting additional product lines at Mulwala and Benalla to satisfy ADF demand, or is it considering Direct Contractor Supply (DCS) or Foreign Military Sales (FMS)?

Answer:

- a) With the exception of 20mm ammunition, Mulwala supplies 100 per cent of the propellant used in munitions assembled for the Australian Defence Force (ADF) at Benalla, including all 127mm Naval Gunnery propelling charges and the bulk of ADF 5.56mm small arms ammunition.
- b) Proportion of overall ADF munitions demand met by Mulwala and Benalla:

Product	Proportion of Overall Demand met by Mulwala and Benalla Facilities between 2012-13 – 2015-16 (%)		Comments
	By Total Spend	By Total Number of Products	
9mm	0	0	Primary source of supply is Winchester Australia (Aus)
5.56mm	88%	51%	
12.7mm MP	0	0	Nammo (Norway) own intellectual property.
12.7mm AP/APIT	0	0	
20mm	57%	25%	
25mm	88%	71%	
30mm	2%	13%	
40mm	0	0	
81mm	0	0	Currently being evaluated for domestic manufacture of US munition.
155mm	0	0	
Grenades	10%	3%	Includes all grenades including smoke grenades manufactured by Chemring Australia.
Other:			
Other 12.7mm	88%	40%	
7.62mm	7%	5%	

Product	Proportion of Overall Demand met by Mulwala and Benalla Facilities between 2012-13 – 2015-16 (%)		Comments
	By Total Spend	By Total Number of Products	
Mk84 and Mk82 Aircraft Bombs	100%	100%	

c) (i) Key ADF munitions that are currently not produced at Benalla and Mulwala:

Product	Supplier(s)	Country of Origin	Total Value (2012-13 – 2015-16)	Comments
84mm	SAAB	Sweden	\$A73m	Single source of global supply
155mm	US Government	USA	\$A70m	Acquired as part of an integrated US weapon system. Feasibility of domestic production being assessed.
81mm	US Government	USA	\$A60m	Acquired as part of an integrated US weapon system. Feasibility of domestic production being assessed.
66mm Rockets	Nammo	Norway	\$A39m	Single source of global supply
127mm high explosive projectiles	US Government	USA	\$A20m	Dictated by platform (ship) safety requirements
120mm tank ammunition	US Government	USA	Nil	Acquired as part of an integrated US weapon system (Abrams Tank).
Flare countermeasures	Chemring Australia	Australia, UK and US	\$A70m	Several aircraft flare natures manufactured in Lara, Vic
70mm Rockets	Thales	France	\$A13m	Single source of global supply

c) (ii) Defence utilises a range of munitions suppliers to deliver the best capabilities to the ADF and achieve value for money. Munition designs are frequently optimised for specific weapon systems, and often acquired as part of an integrated weapon system or combat platform. In a highly competitive global munitions market, suppliers often limit the transfer of Intellectual Property to other manufacturers to maintain market share and economies of scale. Weapon systems sourced from the United States are subject to particularly rigorous government export controls.

In global terms, ADF demand for munitions is low, with Defence procuring insufficient quantities of many munitions to support cost effective production at

Benalla. Many munitions cannot currently be manufactured at Benalla without significant capital investment. Capital investment requirements, limited ADF demand, and increasing weapon and fire control system integration costs, limit the types of munitions that can be viably produced at Benalla and Mulwala.

- d) Defence has undertaken numerous strategic studies on munitions supply, drawing on the expertise of a number of notable external advisers including KPMG, PWC, QinetiQ and Nova.

In 2013, as part of Defence's planning for the Domestic Munitions Manufacturing Arrangements project, the RAND Corporation was commissioned to conduct an evaluation of the Mulwala and Benalla facilities prior to the expiration of the previous supply arrangements. RAND's goal was to provide an independent, objective and quantitative analysis that:

- Established a baseline of global munitions manufacturing practices;
- Compared domestic munitions contracting practices in other allied nations including the United States, Canada, United Kingdom, France, Germany, South Korea, South Africa with those in Australia; and
- Evaluated the economics of manufacturing munitions domestically in Australia versus buying them internationally.

The key conclusions reached in the RAND Report relevant to its ammunition and munitions requirements were:

- **Cost-effective solutions maximise production at domestic plants** - The lowest-cost solution available to the Commonwealth is to purchase munitions from overseas vendors, but if maintaining a domestic munitions industry is desirable, using the full production capacity at Benalla is the key to controlling costs;
- **Global Munitions Practices are Relevant** – The Rand Corporation report found that Governments typically support domestic munitions manufacturing industries for strategic reasons, particularly security of supply. The report also found that Government articulation of the strategic basis for a domestic munitions industry can provide the framework for a contractual relationship.

Publishing details are as follows:

Australia's Munitions Manufacturing Industry – Opportunities for the Future
Paul DeLuca, Ellen M. Pint, James Dryden, Kathryn Connor, Roger Lough,
Sophie-Charlotte Brune, Lauren A. Fleishman-Mayer, Peter Buryk, Clifford A.
Grammich and John Birkler
RAND Corporation 2013

Regional Economic Impact and Assessment- KPMG
Chris Roberts, Iain Bain, Peter Williams and Steve Clark 2012

- e) The long term sustainability of the Benalla and Mulwala facilities is being addressed through a number of strategies.

The new Strategic Munitions Interim Contract which commenced in July 2015, effectively leases the Benalla and Mulwala facilities to Thales Australia Limited for commercial operation. The objective of this contract is to broaden the ADF and commercial munitions product range manufactured at Mulwala and Benalla. Thales has successfully introduced new commercial products and with Defence engineering and financial support has a number of other commercial-in-confidence opportunities pending.

During 2015 Defence established a Munitions Manufacturing Integrated Project Team for ADF munitions. The role of this team is to:

- Optimise utilisation of the Mulwala and Benalla facilities, where feasible;
- Identify opportunities for the Mulwala and Benalla facilities to satisfy current and future ADF munitions needs; and
- Develop detailed business cases for consideration by the appropriate Service to fund additional munitions manufacturing capability at Benalla and Mulwala.

This Integrated Project Team has progressed three new ADF munitions business cases to Army for consideration. Additional opportunities for specialised small arms ammunition manufacture are currently being scoped by a joint Defence and Thales working group.

- f) The Major Munitions Contracts initiative forms part of a broader ADF Munitions Supply Improvement Program to reform Defence munitions supply arrangements.

The Munitions Supply Improvement Program aims to:

- improve value for money;
- reduce transactional costs associated with munitions supply arrangements;
- consolidate supply arrangements; and
- gradually modernise selected ADF munitions.

The Program comprises four reform streams:

- increasing munitions manufacture at Benalla & Mulwala;
- improving the efficiency of commercial sole source arrangements;
- improving the efficiency of Foreign Military Sales procurements; and,
- where viable, consolidating commercial procurements into strategic supply arrangements through the Major Munitions Contracts initiative.

The draft Major Munitions Contracts Request for Tender includes a requirement for tenderers to provide an Australian Industry Capability Plan and address the extent to which they can utilise the Benalla and Mulwala facilities for the manufacture of the ADF munitions listed in the Request for Tender. This is in accordance with the Priority Industry Capability for Selected Ballistic Munitions and Explosives.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence Budget – Percentage of GDP

Question reference number: 187

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

- (1) Did the medium-term projections of the Budget that were published in the 2015-16 Budget include the commitment to have Defence spending reach 2 per cent of GDP in 2023-24?
- (2) Did the medium-term projections of the Budget that were published in the 2015-16 MYEFO include the commitment to have Defence spending reach 2 per cent of GDP in 2023-24? Or did the medium-term projections in the 2015-16 MYEFO reflect the outcomes in the Defence White Paper (2 per cent of GDP in 2020-21)?
- (3) Can Defence confirm that the additional expenditure required to achieve Defence spending of 2 per cent of GDP in 2023-24 – or 2020-21, if it had been assumed in the 2015-16 MYEFO – was already built into the medium-term projections in the Budget? That is, already accounted for in the Budget bottom line going forward?
 - a) If YES: Given that the additional expenditure had already been built into the medium-term projections, can Defence explain how much of the \$29.9 billion is actually new funding? Can Defence provide a profile of this 'new' funding, year-by-year, over the forward estimates and the medium-term to 2025-26?
 - b) If NO: Can Defence explain how the medium-term projections reflected the commitment to have Defence spending reach 2 per cent of GDP, but that it was not accounted for in the Budget bottom line?
- (4) Given that Defence spending will reach 2 per cent of GDP in 2020-21, which is three years earlier than was originally committed to, what factors have allowed for this to occur earlier? For example, did the change to the rate of economic growth over the medium term from 3.5 per cent to 3 per cent mean that it would be easier to reach the 2 per cent of GDP level?
- (5) When was the decision made to bring forward the date at which 2 per cent of GDP was reached in terms of Defence spending?
- (6) When was the decision made to decouple Defence funding from the percentage of GDP concept?

- (7) What factors, apart from Government policy decisions to change the funding profile for Defence, could act to either increase or decrease Defence funding?
- (8) Can Defence please detail what percentage of GDP that Defence spending will be equal to in each of the following years: 2021-22, 2022-23, 2023-24, 2024-25 and 2025-26?
- (9) Will the increased expenditure change the 2015-16 MYEFO projection for the budget returning to surplus in 2020-21?
- (10) Will the increased expenditure change the 2015-16 MYEFO medium-term budget projections, which had the budget in surplus to the level of 0.2 per cent of GDP in 2021-22, then 0.4 per cent of GDP in 2022-23, and then returning back to 0.2 per cent of GDP in 2025-26?
- (11) If all of this funding is 'new funding' or 'new expenditure', has it been subject to the Government's fiscal strategy which is outlined on page 18 of the 2015-16 MYEFO, which states that "new spending measures will be more than offset by reductions in spending elsewhere in the budget"?
 - a) If YES: Does this mean that there are more than \$29.9 billion in cuts to spending as a result?
 - b) If NO: Why has this spending been exempt from the Government's fiscal strategy?

Answer:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The medium-term projections of the Budget that were published in the 2015-16 MYEFO include the commitment to have Defence spending reach 2 per cent of GDP in 2023-24.
- (3) Yes the additional expenditure required to achieve Defence spending of 2 per cent of GDP in 2023-24 was built into the medium-term projections in the Budget.

Defence's new funding profile for 2016-17 to 2025-26 is illustrated on page 180 of the publicly available 2016 Defence White Paper, released on 25 February 2016.
- (4)&(5) The delivery of the Coalition's commitment for Defence spending to reach two per cent of GDP was part of the comprehensive package of decisions that Government made over the course of the White Paper development process.
- (6) The decision to decouple Defence funding from the percentage of GDP concept was part of the comprehensive package of decisions that Government made over the course of the White Paper development process.
- (7) Apart from Government policy changes, other factors that change the Defence funding profile are foreign exchange, and delays or acceleration of planned activities in Defence.
- (8) The Defence White Paper did not publish detailed medium-term projections of Defence expenditure as a share of GDP. The information that underpins the White Paper is both Cabinet-In-Confidence and Commercial-In-Confidence and cannot be released.

Defence's funding profile for 2016-17 to 2025-26 is illustrated on page 180 of the publicly available 2016 Defence White Paper, released on 25 February 2016.

- (9) No.
- (10) No.
- (11) Yes, this is 'new funding' for Defence. Growing the Defence budget to 2 per cent of GDP was a Coalition election commitment.

Questions on broader whole of government fiscal strategy and offsets should be referred to the Department of the Treasury.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence Budget – External Cost Assurance

Question reference number: 188

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

1. Page 178 of the 2016 Defence White Paper states: “Collectively, around 80 per cent of the Defence budget has been externally cost assured by private sector experts, with the remaining budget subject to internal cost analysis and assurance.” Can Defence please outline which elements of the Defence Budget comprised the “around 80 per cent” that was “externally cost assured by private sector experts”?
 - a) Please detail who these private sector experts were.
 - b) Were these private sector experts paid to conduct this cost assurance? If so, what was the cost?
 - c) When did they commence this cost assurance?
 - d) When did they complete the cost assurance?
 - e) Were they given a reference to cost assure all of the Defence Budget?
 - f) What factors led to the fact that they could not cost assure around 20 per cent of the Defence Budget?
2. Which elements of the Defence Budget comprised the around 20 per cent that was not externally cost assured?
 - a) Who conducted the internal cost analysis and assurance?
 - b) What proportion of the sustainment budget was externally cost assured?
 - c) What is the 20 per cent that was not externally cost assured made up of?
 - d) Why could this 20 per cent expenditure not also be externally cost assured?

Answer:

1. The budget elements reviewed included the Defence Integrated Investment Programme, Estate, Sustainment, Information and Communications Technology, Personnel and Operating costs.
 - a) Details of the contracts are published on the Austender website (www.tenders.gov.au).
 - b) Yes. The cost was \$20.1 million (GST exclusive).
 - c) The cost assurance tasking commenced in August 2014.
 - d) The cost assurance activities were completed in November 2015.
 - e) No. Tasks were allocated to providers to cost assure individual (or bundled) elements of the Defence budget (e.g. the Future Frigates project).
 - f) Due to the low risk, predictable nature of the remaining budget elements, external cost assurance did not represent value for money.
2. Elements not externally cost assured comprised low value, low risk elements such as training, other plant and equipment, repair and overhaul of non-military equipment, travel and legal services.
 - a) Internal cost assurance of the remaining 20 per cent was largely coordinated by Defence's Chief Finance Officer Group.
 - b) 100 per cent.
 - c) Refer to question 2 response above.
 - d) Due to the low risk, predictable nature of those budget elements comprising the 20 per cent, external cost assurance did not represent value for money.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence Budget – Department of Finance

Question reference number: 189

Senator/Member: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

- (1) As part of the formulation of the new Defence budget, as well as costings for the capability investments that are detailed in the Defence Integrated Investment Program, was the Department of Finance involved in any of the work in relation to this?
 - (a) Did Finance agree to the costings for the capability investments detailed in the Defence Integrated Investment Program? If not, why not?
- (2) Can Defence please explain why there is \$700 million in additional expenditure (excluding operations) in 2016-17 but then nothing in 2017-18?

Answer:

- (1) Yes.
- (2) The funding profile delivered through the White Paper was required to meet Defence's anticipated expenditure profile resulting from the Integrated Investment Program. Additional funding was not required in 2017-18.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence Budget – New and Approved Programs

Question reference number: 190

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (1) In the Defence Integrated Investment Program document, there are graphs which show the indicative acquisition windows of key approved and new programs (pages 27, 39, 65, 77, 93 and 105).
 - (a) Can Defence please provide the details of the estimated expenditure, year-by-year, for each of the items listed there, including funding profiles and the indicative start and end dates for each?
 - (b) Where relevant, can Defence please provide details of when individual platforms would be acquired for each of the items?

Answer:

- (1) The 2016 Integrated Investment Program provides a summary of key investment decisions for each capability stream from 2016 to 2035, including program timeframe and approximate investment value. Information regarding the programs can be found in each Capability Stream of the document.
 - (a) & (b) The detailed information sought for these programs is currently Commercial-In-Confidence and cannot be released.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Budget Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence Budget – Defence Industry Policy Statement

Question reference number: 191

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

In the Defence Industry Policy Statement, there are three particular initiatives that are funded – the Centre for Defence Industry Capability, the Defence Innovation Hub, and the Next Generation Technologies Fund.

- (a) Can Defence please provide the profile of expenditure for each of these initiatives, year-by-year, through to 2025-26?
- (b) Can Defence please outline how much of this expenditure is new funding versus funding that has been repurposed from existing initiatives?
- (c) Specifically for the Centre for Defence Industry Capability initiative, can Defence please provide the profile of expenditure, year-by-year, through to 2025-26 for the following elements and sub-elements, and identify how much of this expenditure is new funding versus funding that has been repurposed from existing initiatives:
 - Industry Development Stream
 - Australian Industry Capability facilitation function
 - Delivery model of skilling programs, including the “Skilling Australia’s Defence Industry” program
 - Defence Engineering Internship Program
 - Schools Pathway Program
 - F1 in Schools/Subs in Schools
 - Defence Industrial Capability Plan
 - Defence Innovation Portal
 - Business Competitiveness and Exports
 - Global Supply Chain Program
 - Team Defence Australia

- (d) Specifically for the Defence Innovation Hub initiative, can Defence please provide the profile of expenditure, year-by-year, through to 2025-26 for the following elements and sub-elements, and identify how much of this expenditure is new funding versus funding that has been repurposed from existing initiatives:

- Capability Technology Demonstrator
- Rapid Prototyping Development and Evaluation
- Defence Innovation Realisation Fund
- Priority Industry Capability Development Fund
- Chief Information Officer Innovation Program
- Defence Materials Technology Centre

Answer:

- (a)(c) & (d) No. Year by year breakdowns of funding will be determined as planning for Defence Industry Policy Statement initiatives matures. It should be noted that future breakdowns of funding may change depending on Defence's requirements.
- (b) The Centre for Defence Industry Capability is funded to around \$230 million over the decade to 2025-26 from a redirection of existing funding. The Defence Innovation Hub is funded to around \$640 million over the decade to 2025-26 from a redirection of existing funding. The Next Generation Technology Fund is funded to around \$730 million over the decade to 2025-26 from new funding.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: South China Sea

Question reference number: 192

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

Paragraph 3.9 of the Defence White Paper states:

“Our third Strategic Defence Interest is in a stable Indo-Pacific region and rules-based global order which supports Australia’s interests. The Indo-Pacific includes North Asia, the South China Sea and the extensive sea lines of communication in the Indian and Pacific Oceans that support Australian trade. A stable rules-based regional order is critical to ensuring Australia’s access to an open, free and secure trading system and minimising the risk of coercion and instability that would directly affect Australia’s interests. A stable rules-based global order serves to deal with threats before they become existential threats to Australia, and enables our unfettered access to trading routes, secure communications and transport to support Australia’s economic development.”

- (a) Does Defence consider that China’s recent actions in the South China Sea – including land reclamation and militarisation of maritime features – represent a challenge to a stable rules-based regional order in the Indo-Pacific region?
- (b) Does Defence consider that China’s recent actions in the South China Sea – including land reclamation and militarisation of maritime features – are contrary to the third Strategic Defence Interest identified in the Defence White Paper?

Answer:

(a) and (b) As noted in the 2016 Defence White Paper, territorial disputes between claimants in the South China Seas have created uncertainty and tension in our region. Australia has called on all claimants to exercise self-restraint, take steps to ease tensions and refrain from provocative actions that could increase tension and uncertainty in the region.

The White Paper also states that Australia does not take sides on competing territorial claims in the South China Sea but we are concerned that land reclamation and construction activity by claimants raises tensions in the region. Australia is particularly concerned by the unprecedented pace and scale of China’s land reclamation activities.

Australia has called on all South China Sea claimants to halt land reclamation and construction activities, which involves the dredging of sea floor material for use as landfill in creating artificial structures. It is important that claimant countries are open and transparent about the end state purposes of land reclamation activities.

Australia has also called on China and the Philippines to abide by the Arbitral Tribunal's Award of 12 July 2016 in the *Philippines-China* arbitration, which is final and legally binding on both parties. This decision is an important test case for how the region can manage disputes peacefully. It is an opportunity for the region to come together, and for claimants to re-engage in dialogue with each other based on greater clarity around maritime rights.

Australia opposes the assertion of associated territorial claims and maritime rights which are not in accordance with international law, including the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. The absence of an agreed framework for managing the competing claims in the South China Sea highlights the importance of Association of South-East Asian Nations and China agreeing to a Code of Conduct for the South China Sea as soon as possible.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence White Paper – APS Workforce

Question reference number: 193

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (1) Paragraph 6.59 of the 2016 Defence White Paper states: “Defence will develop a 10-year Strategic Workforce Plan in 2016. The Strategic Workforce Plan will set out the skills Defence needs and detail how Defence will attract, retain and develop its people.”
 - (a) What is the status of the Strategic Workforce Plan?
 - (b) When will the Strategic Workforce Plan be finalised? Will it be publicly released? If not, why not? Will it be a classified document? Will the entire plan be classified?
- (2) The Australian Public Service ‘Skills Census’ is currently under way in Defence.
 - (a) Is the Skills Census a part of the Strategic Workforce Plan, or is this a separate process?
 - (b) Has the Skills Census begun? What is the timeframe for completing the Skills Census?
 - (c) Was there any consideration given to completing this Skills Census and Strategic Workforce Plan before the Defence White Paper was completed – so that these documents could feed into the 2016 Defence White Paper? Why didn’t this happen?
- (3) Paragraph 6.16 of the 2016 Defence White Paper states: “The Defence White Paper provides for a future Australian Public Service (APS) workforce of around 18,200 Full Time Staff Equivalent (FTE), down from 22,300 FTE in June 2012.”
 - (a) What is the current Full Time Staff Equivalent of the Department?
 - (b) Given both the Strategic Workforce Plan and the Skills Census are yet to be completed, how was the figure of 18,200 FTE decided on?

Answer:

- (1)(a)-(b) The Strategic Workforce Plan is currently being developed, and will be finalised in the second half of 2016. The plan is focused on the actions that Defence must take to deliver the outcomes of the 2016 Defence White Paper. The Strategic Workforce Plan will be unclassified and at this stage there is no intention to release the document publicly.
- (2)(a)(b) Yes. The skills census will be completed in the second half of 2016.
- (2)(c) No. The Strategic Workforce Plan, which will incorporate the outcomes of the skills census, is being developed in accordance with the Australian Standard for Workforce Planning. This identifies that workforce planning should be based on an organisation's strategic direction, which is provided for Defence by the 2016 Defence White Paper.
- (3)(a) The Australian Public Service Full Time Equivalent was 17,868 at 24 March 2016.
- (3)(b) The 18,200 figure was derived from an assessment of future capability requirements through the Force Structure Review.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates - 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence White Paper – APS Workforce – Priority Positions

Question reference number: 194

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Paragraphs 6.17 and 6.18 of the 2016 Defence White Paper state: “Within this total workforce of around 18,200 FTE, enhancements to intelligence, space and cyber security capabilities will involve 800 new APS positions.” “These new APS positions in areas of high priority will be offset by ongoing reductions elsewhere in the APS workforce.”

- (a) In what areas will the ongoing reductions occur?
- (b) Over what timeframe will the ongoing reductions occur?
- (c) Is it the case that 800 new positions are being created, and 800 will be lost through ‘ongoing reductions’?
- (d) How many individual staff who are currently employed in the positions that will be lost does Defence estimate will be able to transfer across to the new ‘higher priority’ positions?
- (e) How many ‘separations’ – that is, job losses – does Defence expect as a result of this process, including resignations, retirements, redundancies (both forced and voluntary) and sackings?
 - Over what timeframe will these separations occur?
 - In what areas will these separations occur?

Answer:

(a)-(e) Defence has been consciously reducing its Australian Public Service workforce since 2012 through natural attrition, disciplined recruitment practices, and a limited voluntary redundancy program aimed at reducing the number of staff at middle management levels (Executive Levels 1 and 2).

As shown in Table 13 of the *Portfolio Additional Estimates Statements 2015-16*, the APS workforce is forecast to be 17,500 Full Time Equivalent by the end of 2015-16. This provides a base level for recruitment into priority areas taking APS numbers to 18,200 in future years without the need for substantial further reductions elsewhere.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Budget Estimates – 10 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence White Paper – Enterprise Agreement – Staff Retention

Question reference number: 195

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Paragraph 6.33 of the 2016 Defence White Paper states: “We will continue to ensure that the employment offers to Defence staff remain competitive to attract and retain the right number of people with the right skills Defence requires.” Earlier this month staff in Defence rejected the proposed Defence Enterprise Agreement 2016-2019.

- (a) Does Defence agree that there is a disconnect between, on the one hand, making a commitment in the White Paper to retain staff through attractive employment offers, and on the other hand, not coming to the table with an enterprise agreement that Defence staff are willing to accept?
- (b) Given this commitment in the Defence White Paper, what changes will be made to the proposed agreement and negotiating process to ensure that the Defence Enterprise Agreement 2016-2019 does attract and retain staff?

Answer:

- (a) No.
- (b) Defence has put its best offer forward for staff to consider.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence White Paper – ADF Workforce – Reallocations

Question reference number: 196

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question: Paragraph 6.8 of the 2016 Defence White Paper states: “The transition to the future force will require the reallocation of around 2,300 existing ADF positions to higher priority activities.”

- (a) Where will these positions be reallocated from?
- (b) What will be the process for deciding where these positions will be reallocated from?
- (c) Over what timeframe will these reallocations occur?

Answer:

- (a)&(b) The forthcoming 2016 Defence Strategic Workforce Plan, developed in response to the 2016 Defence White Paper, will provide the basis for subordinate workforce plans.

Personnel will be reallocated to new capabilities in accordance with the workforce plans.

- (c) The reallocations will occur over decade 2016-2026.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence White Paper -Recruitment Strategies - Submariners

Question reference number: 197

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Paragraph 6.9 of the 2016 Defence White Paper states: “The larger maritime and anti-submarine force will require an increase of around 800 ADF positions, with further growth beyond the decade to operate the larger submarine fleet in particular”.

- (a) Can Defence please provide any more detail about the recruitment strategies to meet this goal?
- (b) When does Defence expect to reach this goal of 800 new positions?
- (c) How does Defence intend to retain these additional 800 positions given historical challenges with retention, particularly for the submarine force?

Answer:

(a) and (c) Defence is currently developing a Strategic Workforce Plan, which will identify initiatives that will enable the growth and retention of the workforce that is outlined in the 2016 Defence White Paper.

(b) As identified in the 2016 Defence White Paper, the growth of the 800 new positions will occur over the next decade.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence White Paper – Defence Budget – Personnel

Question reference number: 198

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (1) Paragraph 8.14 of the 2016 Defence White Paper states that the proportion of Defence budget allocated to personnel will reduce from 37 to 26 per cent.
 - (a) What is the rationale behind this decrease?
 - (b) What modelling was this based on and who did it?
 - (c) How will this decrease be achieved?
- (2) Paragraph 8.14 of the 2016 Defence White Paper also states that Defence operating costs will remain at 7 to 9 per cent of the Defence Budget. What modelling is this based on and who conducted the modelling?
- (3) Paragraph 8.14 of the 2016 Defence White Paper also states that the proportion of the Defence budget allocated to sustainment will increase from 25 to 28 per cent. What modelling is this based on and who conducted the modelling?

Answer:

- (1)(a) and (c) Investment in Defence's people capability will actually grow from \$12 billion to \$15.3 billion by 2025-26. It only reduces as a proportion of the Defence budget, as a reflection of the Government's priority to reinvest in Defence capabilities for the future - the budget for which will grow from \$9 billion to \$23 billion over the same period.
- (1)(b), (2) and (3) The Defence funding model is based on a fully costed future force structure, with external validation by experts in cost assurance from private sector companies which are globally recognised.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence White Paper – Defence Estate

Question reference number: 199

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question:

Paragraph 7.32 of the 2016 Defence White Paper discusses Estate Rationalisation and says it will be considered on a 'case by case basis.'

- (a) Is any part of the Defence estate currently being considered for sale?
 - (i) If YES: What are the sites/bases/assets and what is the timeframe?
 - (ii) If NO: Can Defence confirm there is currently no consideration of the sale of any part or parts of the Defence estate?

Answer:

- (a) Yes. Defence regularly reviews the disposition of its estate to ensure it continues to support capability.
 - (i) Defence is progressing the sale of the following sites that have been approved for disposal:

Property	Target Disposal Date	Description
Australian Capital Territory		
Fairbairn (Pialligo Ave South and Majura Road)	Jun-2017	Surplus land.
Lawson (Belconnen Naval Transmitter Station)	Oct-2016	Former transmitter station.
Werriwa Reserve Depot	Oct-2016	Former Reserve depot.

Property	Target Disposal Date	Description
New South Wales		
Defence Establishment Orchard Hills	Jan-2017	Partial disposal to support proposed upgrade of the Northern Road, Sydney.
Defence Establishment Orchard Hills	Dec-2016	Partial disposal to support water infrastructure.
Haberfield Depot	Jun-2017	Former Reserve depot.
Holsworthy (Wedderburn Rd)	Jun-2017	Vacant land adjacent to Holsworthy Barracks.
Holsworthy Sewerage Treatment Plant	Oct-2016	Portion of land for sewerage treatment plant.
Holsworthy Sub-Station	Jun-2017	Portion of land for an electricity substation.
Londonderry	Jun-2017	Former transmitter station.
Moorebank (Inter-Modal Terminal) Casula	Jun-2016	4 lots of land to be transferred to the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development for Intermodal Terminal.
Moorebank Sub-Station	Jun-2017	Portion of land for an electricity sub-station.
Mulwala - Parcels Of Land	Jun-2017	3 surplus land parcels adjacent to the munitions manufacturing facility.
RAAF Wagga Aerodrome	Post 2017	Partial disposal of aerodrome portion of site (current lease expires 2025).
Northern Territory		
Nil		
Queensland		
Bulimba Barracks	Jun-2017	Partial disposal of the barracks site.
Dysart Reserve Depot	Dec-2016	Former Reserve depot.
Goodna Road	Oct-2016	Parcel of land for road easement.
Maryborough Rifle Range	Nov-2016	Former rifle range.
Mount Vince Rifle Range	Jun-2017	Former rifle range.
Rockhampton Rifle Range	Jun-2017	Former rifle range buffer zone.
South Australia		
Coomunga Rifle Range	Jun-2017	Former rifle range.
Inverbrackie	Dec-2016	Former married quarter precinct attached to Woodside Barracks.
Tasmania		
Nil		
Victoria		
310 St Kilda Road	Aug-2017	Surplus building at Victoria Barracks; a former repatriation facility.
Maribyrnong	Jun-2026	Former munitions and explosives factory. After sale terms are agreed, extensive remediation work will be required prior to final property settlement.
Married Quarters Bonegilla	Jun-2017	Former married quarters precinct of Latchford Barracks.

Property	Target Disposal Date	Description
Western Australia		
Bullsbrook – Road Link	Jun-2017	Partial disposal of Bullsbrook Training Area to the State for a road project.
Bullsbrook Lot 1	Dec-2016	Former World War II bunker.
Bullsbrook Lot 50	Dec-2016	Former radar site.
Kalgoorlie Rifle Range	Jun-2017	Former rifle range.
Leeuwin Barracks	Jun-2017	Land and buildings of Leeuwin Barracks.

(ii) Not applicable.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs Defence and Trade

Senate Additional Budget Estimates –17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence White Paper – Defence Enablers

Question reference number: 200

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Paragraph 7.31 of the 2016 Defence White Paper refers to Defence enablers such as information management and the Defence estate being fully integrated within a single Defence service delivery system.

- (a) What does this integration involve?
- (b) Where is this process up to?
- (c) Do you anticipate that this integration will result in job losses, including for staff employed by contractors?
 - (i) If Yes: How many, from where and over what timeframe?

Answer:

- (a) The enabling services currently have separate entry points which means customers have to understand how each enabler operates to get the services they need. The Integrated Service Delivery Model will establish a single point of entry for customers and a dedicated support function to coordinate requests that require engagement from multiple enablers. It will change the way that enablers work together and result in a better experience for customers.
- (b) The Integrated Service Delivery Model has been approved by the First Principles Review Implementation Committee and is currently at the project start-up phase. Implementation planning, assignment of resources, communication planning, and establishment of governance processes are underway.
- (c) No.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence White Paper – Defence Workforce – Job Consolidation

Question reference number: 201

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Paragraph 7.36 of the 2016 Defence White Paper states that Defence will further consolidate its other enabling corporate services such as finance, human resource management and administration.

- (a) How many job losses does Defence envisage this further consolidation will lead to – both in terms of civilian jobs and contractors?
 - (i) For APS job losses, what level(s) will they occur at?
 - (ii) What is Defence's estimated breakdown of part-time and full-time job losses?
 - (iii) Where will these job losses occur in terms of geographical location(s)?
 - (iv) Will voluntary redundancies be offered?
 - (v) If not enough voluntary redundancies are taken, will there be forced redundancies?
 - (vi) If NO jobs losses are anticipated: How will the consolidation work occur without job losses?

Answer:

(a)(i)-(v) No job losses are envisaged.

(a)(vi) 'Consolidation' refers to finalising the establishment of shared services for the corporate functions. By the end of 2016, it is planned that all corporate functions will have completed the consolidation process which means there will be a single accountable officer (e.g. Chief Finance Officer, Chief Information Officer, Deputy Secretary People) for each corporate service.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence White Paper – One Defence Behavioural Model

Question reference number: 202

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Paragraph 7.13 of the 2016 Defence White Paper refers to the implementation of the One Defence Behavioural Model.

- (a) What does the One Defence Behavioural Model strive to achieve?
- (b) Can Defence please provide an update on its implementation?
- (c) Has the new performance management system been implemented yet?
- (d) Will all Defence personnel be managed under this new performance management system – both military and civilian?

Answer:

- (a) The One Defence Behaviour Model is focused on better individual and organisation performance through behaviour that is accountable. There are four key outcomes of the behavioural model:
 - Leaders make decisions which are in the interest of Defence as a whole, demonstrating individual accountability for joint success;
 - Changed behaviours drive optimal organisational and performance outcomes;
 - Individuals feel their contributions are valued by the organisation; and
 - The organisation is strongly engaged with performance management.
- (b) There are multiple streams of activity to implement the behavioural model. Some activities have been completed. These include:
 - Better alignment of leader's responsibility with whole of Defence outcomes through performance appraisals being aligned to corporate plans;
 - Development of role charters for senior leaders with a clear statement of leadership accountabilities;
 - Enhanced performance management through increased feedback to senior leaders on their behaviour; and

- A focus on lifting capability and accountability of senior leaders and executive level staff through programs that include 360 feedback and improving leadership and collaboration across Defence.

Progress is continuing on applying greater weighting in performance appraisals against behaviour and how results are delivered.

(c) Yes in part. A new performance management system has been implemented for the Senior Executive Service (SES). For non-SES staff, work to date has been focused on improving support for staff to have more effective performance conversations.

(d) Yes, however the focus to date has been on the APS workforce.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence White Paper – Performance Management System

Question reference number: 203

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

- (1) Paragraph 7.13 of the 2016 Defence White Paper states: “Defence will institute a performance management system that links employees’ roles and actions to Defence’s goals and deliverables.”
 - (a) In practical terms, what will this actually mean for Defence staff – both APS and ADF?
- (2) Paragraph 7.13 of the 2016 Defence White Paper refers to “improved performance measures”. What will these measures be?

Answer:

- (1)(a) The desired outcome of the performance management system is that individuals are held accountable for their behaviour and understand how their effort contributes to achieving Defence’s goals and deliverables. Role Charters that reinforce the One Defence leadership behaviours and specify key individual and shared accountabilities have been developed for senior Defence leaders. All Australian Defence Force and Australian Public Service performance agreements must link to the Defence Corporate Plan or Group and Service Plans.
- (2) Other specific performance measures are still being finalised.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 February 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence White Paper – First Principles Review – Defence Committees

Question reference number: 204

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Paragraph 7.17 of the 2016 Defence White Paper commits to reducing the number of Defence committees.

- (a) Has this process begun? If YES: Which committees have been eliminated so far?
- (b) What is the timeframe for this process?
- (c) Which committees will be eliminated?
- (d) What is the process for determining which committees will be eliminated?
- (e) What process is being put in place to ensure that as the number of committees reduces, the gender balance across committee membership improves?

Answer:

(a) Yes. As of 5 April 2016, Defence has ceased 21 senior committees (listed below):

1. Secretary and the Chief of the Defence Force Advisory Committee
2. Defence Information and Communication Technology Committee
3. Defence Strategic Reform Advisory Board
4. Cultural Reform Steering Committee
5. Defence Science and Technology Organisation Advisory Board
6. Finance Systems Governance Board
7. Defence Industry Innovation Board (external)
8. Capability, Acquisition and Sustainment Group Strategic Budget Committee
9. Council Chairs Forum
10. Procurement Council
11. Sustainment Management and Materiel Logistics Council
12. Materiel Engineering Council
13. Defence Materiel Organisation Advisory Group on Diversity
14. Chief Information Officer Group Organisational Review Project Board
15. Information and Communication Technology Investment Review Committee
16. Defence Capability and Investment Committee

17. Defence Estate Performance and Investment Committee
18. Project Initiation and Review Board
19. Defence Capability Committee
20. Defence Capability Plan Force Modernisation Executive
21. Australian Defence College Advisory Board

- (b)-(c) This process is ongoing. Defence is currently reviewing committees chaired by Band 2/2 Star and Band 1/1 Star staff.
- (d) The senior committee structure was determined by the First Principles Review. Flowing from this structure, committee rules were established and the chairs of each committee must assess the requirement for their committee against these rules. An annual review of the requirement for and effectiveness of each committee will also occur.
- (e) One of the committee rules is that Defence ensures “*appropriate membership (in level/rank, numbers and organisational representation) with each member having a pertinent reason for attending. The membership is diverse (gender, culture and skills) to improve organisational performance.*”

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Defence White Paper – Future Force Design

Question reference number: 205

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Paragraph 7.20 of the 2016 Defence White Paper commits to establishing a permanent future force design function.

- (a) What will be the role of future force design function?
- (b) What will be the composition of the future force design function – both in terms of staff and other resources?
- (c) What is the timeframe for establishing the future force design function?

Answer:

The force design process is a scalable and flexible process of translation of strategic policy to a vision of the future force structure.

- (a) The future force design function allows for systematic examination of force structure options, to design proposals for the future force that are both credible and consistent with Government's requirements of the future Australian Defence Force (ADF).
- (b) and (c) The future force design function will comprise three concurrent processes providing a continual ability to respond organisationally to changes in estimations of the challenges of Australia's future security environment.

Joint Force Analysis involves identification of emerging threats and potential responses, development and testing of operating concepts, identification and consideration of gaps, risks and issues in Defence through operational research and analysis, war-gaming and experimentation in collaboration with Capability Managers and Enabler groups.

Options Development involves gap, risk and issue validation and development of a set of options in response to a gap, risk or issue including pragmatically assessing the measurable difference between options in terms of cost and capability, and quickly curtailing unfeasible options.

Force Planning and Prioritisation involves prioritising capability options developed with consideration to the balance of investments, analysis of alternatives, interdependencies, fundamental inputs to capability and trade-off implications i.e. what existing work might have to give way to “fit” the new option.

The future force design function will comprise approximately 113 ADF and Australian Public Service (APS) personnel, along with additional Defence Science and Technology Group embedded staff, contractor and Reserve support. Force Design Division’s functional capacity will develop in performance as staffing augments into 2017.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Contestability function and quality of advice

Question reference number: 206

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

1. Paragraph 7.21 of the 2016 Defence White Paper outlines a new internal contestability function.
 - (a) Can Defence please provide more detail about the contestability function? For example, what does it mean, and for who?
 - (b) Does this function exist yet, and if not, what is the timeframe for implementation?
2. Paragraph 7.23 of the 2016 Defence White Paper states that Defence will improve the strategy and policy advice to Government.
 - (a) How would Defence describe the current quality of the advice to Government?
 - (b) What aspects of the current level of advice need improving?
 - (c) Has there been a particular piece of advice that has been deemed sub-standard?
 - (d) How did this particular statement in the 2016 Defence White Paper come about?

Answer:

- (1)
 - (a) The contestability function will provide arms-length, evidence-based assessments of capability and investment proposals. It will enable Defence to provide assurance to Government that capability and investment proposals are aligned with strategy and resources. The contestability function will be integrated across the span of the capability life cycle, from concept to disposal. Contestability will be proportionate and based on the risk profile for any given capability or investment proposal.
 - (b) Yes. Contestability is an integral part of the new capability life cycle process that commenced in April. The contestability function builds on existing Defence capabilities for investment analysis and cost assurance. The design of the contestability function will gradually add additional capability and

capacity, informed by our experience operating the new capability life cycle and investment approach.

- (2)(a)-(d) The First Principles Review was critical of the quality of policy advice in Defence, noting that it could be diffuse, inconsistent and fragmented. The Review recommended that policy advice be strengthened by bringing all policy functions into one organisational unit to improve the quality of policy advice to government. This recommendation was accepted by the Government and has been implemented by Defence.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Staff Transition – DMO to CASG

Question reference number: 207

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: provided in writing

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 22 April 2016

Question:

Can Defence please provide an overview of how the transition from DMO to CASG is progressing?

- (a) How many or what percentage of DMO staff are now working in CASG?
- (b) Of the DMO staff who are not now working in CASG, how many are elsewhere in the Department of Defence, and how many have left the Department altogether?
- (c) What were the roles of those staff who have left Defence?
- (d) What was the breakdown of part-time and full time, and what level were they?
- (e) Of those staff who have left Defence, can Defence please break down that figure into numbers of resignations, retirements, redundancies and sackings?
 - (i) Of the redundancies, how many of these received a redundancy package?
 - (ii) Of these redundancies, how many were voluntary?
 - (iii) If there were any non-voluntary redundancies, what were the circumstances surrounding those?
 - (iv) Of the retirements, did anyone receive an 'incentive to retire' payment? If so, what were the circumstances surrounding the decision to make those payments?
 - (v) If there were sackings, were they on grounds of misconduct or incompetence? Can Defence please provide details of the circumstances surrounding these?
- (f) Have any contractors or non-ongoing staff within DMO had their contracts terminated in the transition to CASG?
 - (i) If so, how many?
 - (ii) Were any contracts ended or terminated earlier than specified in the contract?

Answer:

- (a) As at 30 June 2015 there were 4,537 Australian Public Service (APS) personnel working in the Defence Materiel Organisation (DMO). As at 29 February 2016, 4,078 of these were working in the Capability Acquisition and Sustainment Group (CASG).
- (b) As at 29 February 2016, of the APS personnel no longer in CASG, 370 have left Defence and 89 are working elsewhere within the Department.
- (c) The roles undertaken by the 370 APS personnel who have left Defence are shown in the following table:

Job Family	Left Department
Administration & Corporate Support	51
Asset Management	25
Auditing & Assurance	10
Communication & Stakeholder Management	5
Engineering and Technical	90
Finance	1
Information & Knowledge Managementt	3
Information Communications Technologies	4
Legal	4
Logistics	58
People	2
Procurement and Contracting	44
Project Management	60
Senior Officer	9
Trades & Labour	1
Other	3
Grand Total	370

- (d) Refer to the table below for the breakdown of part-time and full-time staff, and their classification:

APS Classification	Full-Time	Part-Time	Total
TRAINEE	2		2
GRAD	12		12
APS2	1		1
APS3	13	3	16
APS4	17	2	19
APS5	59	1	60
APS6	68	2	70
EL1	121	12	133
EL2	45	3	48
SES1	2		2
SES2	2		2
SES3	5		5
Grand Total	347	23	370

(e) Refer to the table below:

Separation Reason	Non-Ongoing Employee	Ongoing Employee	Total
Breach of Code of Conduct		1	1
Completion of non-ongoing contract	4		4
Invalidity Retirement/Other		10	10
Resignation	1	124	125
Age retirement		72	72
Senior Executive Service – Incentive to Separate		4	4
Movement to other APS Agency		28	28
Voluntary Redundancy		126	126
Total	5	365	370

(i) All redundancies received a package.

(ii) and (iii) All redundancies were voluntary and were offered where Defence agreed that it was consistent with organisational needs and requirements.

(iv) Voluntary Redundancies and Section 37 separations, which attracted incentives to retire, were based on organisational restructure under the First Principles Review and were made in accordance with APS policy.

(v) There was one separation due to a code of conduct breach.

(f) None.

Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade

Additional Estimates – 17 March 2016

ANSWER TO QUESTION ON NOTICE

Department of Defence

Topic: Minister's reports to National Security Committee of Cabinet

Question reference number: 208

Senator: Conroy

Type of question: Written

Date set by the committee for the return of answer: 14 September 2016

Question: Paragraph 7.39 of the 2016 Defence White Paper outlines reporting on the implementation of the First Principles Review, including that the Minister will make annual reports on the progress of the implementation to the National Security Committee of Cabinet.

- (a) Has the first of these annual reports occurred yet?
 - (i) If YES: When did it occur?
 - (ii) If NO: When is it due to occur?
- (b) Is any aspect of the reporting on the implementation going to be made public, including the Minister's annual reports and/or the regular reports of the Oversight Board?
 - (i) If NO: Is this because this reporting is classified? If so, which parts are expected to be classified?

Answer:

- (a)(i) No.
- (a)(ii) October 2016.
- (b) No.
- (b)(i) The Minister for Defence is planning to make a statement in Parliament on implementation progress after the Government's consideration of the annual report later in 2016.